THE NEW

SCHAFF-HERZOG ENCYCLOPEDIA

OF

RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE

EDITED BY

SAMUEL MACAULEY JACKSON, D.D., LL.D.
(Editor-in-Chief)

WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF

CHARLES COLEBROOK SHERMAN
[VOLUMES I—VI]

AND

GEORGE WILLIAM GILMORE, M.A.
(Associate Editors)

AND THE FOLLOWING DEPARTMENT EDITORS

CLARENCE AUGUSTINE BECKWITH, D.D.
(Department of Systematic Theology)

HENRY KING CARROLL, LL.D.
(Department of Minor Denominations)

JAMES FRANCIS DRISCOLL, D.D.
(Department of Liturgics and Religious Orders)

JAMES FREDERIC McCURDY, PH.D., LL.D.
(Department of the Old Testament)

HENRY SYLVESTER NASH, D.D.
(Department of the New Testament)

ALBERT HENRY NEWMAN, D.D., LL.D.
(Department of Church History)

FRANK HORACE VIZETELLY, F.S.A.
(Department of Pronunciation and Typography)

Complete in Twelve Volumes

FUNK AND WAGNALLS COMPANY
NEW YORK AND LONDON

THE NEW

SCHAFF-HERZOG ENCYCLOPEDIA

OF

RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE

EDITED BY

SAMUEL MACAULEY JACKSON, D.D., LL.D.
(*Editor-in-Chief*)

WITH THE SOLE ASSISTANCE, AFTER VOLUME VI., OF

GEORGE WILLIAM GILMORE, M.A.
(*Associate Editor*)

AND THE FOLLOWING DEPARTMENT EDITORS

CLARENCE AUGUSTINE BECKWITH, D.D.
(*Department of Systematic Theology*)

HENRY KING CARROLL, LL.D.
(*Department of Minor Denominations*)

JAMES FRANCIS DRISCOLL, D.D.
(*Department of Liturgics and Religious Orders*)

JAMES FREDERIC McCURDY, PH.D., LL.D.
(*Department of the Old Testament*)

HENRY SYLVESTER NASH, D.D.
(*Department of the New Testament*)

ALBERT HENRY NEWMAN, D.D., LL.D.
(*Department of Church History*)

FRANK HORACE VIZETELLY, F.S.A.
(*Department of Pronunciation and Typography*)

VOLUME IX

PETRI — REUCHLIN

FUNK AND WAGNALLS COMPANY
NEW YORK AND LONDON

COPYRIGHT, 1911, BY
FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY

Registered at Stationers' Hall, London, England

Printed in the United States of America
Published January, 1911

EDITORS

SAMUEL MACAULEY JACKSON, D.D., LL.D.
(EDITOR-IN-CHIEF.)
Professor of Church History, New York University.

GEORGE WILLIAM GILMORE, M.A.
(ASSOCIATE EDITOR.)
New York,
Formerly Professor of Biblical History and Lecturer on Comparative Religion, Bangor Theological Seminary.

DEPARTMENT EDITORS, VOLUME IX

CLARENCE AUGUSTINE BECKWITH, D.D.,
(Department of Systematic Theology.)
Professor of Systematic Theology, Chicago Theological Seminary.

HENRY KING CARROLL, LL.D.,
(Department of Minor Denominations.)
Secretary of Executive Committee of the Western Section for the Fourth Ecumenical Methodist Conference.

JAMES FRANCIS DRISCOLL, D.D.,
(Department of Liturgics and Religious Orders.)
Rector of St. Gabriel's, New Rochelle, N. Y.

JAMES FREDERICK McCURDY, Ph.D., LL.D.
(Department of the Old Testament.)
Professor of Oriental Languages, University College, Toronto.

HENRY SYLVESTER NASH, D.D.,
(Department of the New Testament.)
Professor of the Literature and Interpretation of the New Testament, Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Mass.

ALBERT HENRY NEWMAN, D.D., LL.D.,
(Department of Church History.)
Professor of Church History, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Fort Worth, Tex.

FRANK HORACE VIZETELLY, F.S.A.,
(Department of Pronunciation and Typography.)
Managing Editor of the STANDARD DICTIONARY, etc., New York City.

CONTRIBUTORS AND COLLABORATORS, VOLUME IX

JUSTIN EDWARDS ABBOTT, D.D.,
Missionary in Bombay, India.

HANS ACHELIS, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Theology, University of Halle.

SAMUEL JUNE BARROWS (†), D.D.,
Late Corresponding Secretary of the Prison Association, New York.

GEORGE JAMES BAYLES, Ph.D.,
Writer on Civil Church Law.

DONALD BEATON,
Minister at Wick, Scotland.

CLARENCE AUGUSTINE BECKWITH, D.D.,
Professor of Systematic Theology, Chicago Theological Seminary.

GEORG BEER, Ph.D., Th.Lic.,
Extraordinary Professor of the Old Testament in the Evangelical Theological Faculty, University of Strasburg.

HENRY BEETS,
Stated Clerk of the Synod of the Christian Reformed Church, Editor-in-Chief of *The Banner*, Grand Rapids, Mich.

KARL BENRATH, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Church History, University of Königsberg.

IMMANUEL GUSTAV ADOLF BENZINGER, Ph.D., Th.Lic.,
German Orientalist and Vice-Consul for Holland in Jerusalem.

CARL BERTHEAU, Th.D.,
Pastor at St. Michael's, Hamburg.

EDWIN MUNSELL BLISS, D.D.,
Author of Books on Missions, Washington, D. C.

THEODORA CROSBY BLISS,
Writer on Missions.

MABEL THORP BOARDMAN,
Member of Executive Committee of the American National Red Cross.

HEINRICH BOEHMER, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Church History, University of Bonn.

GOTTLIEB NATHANAEL BONWETSCH, Th.D.,
Professor of Church History, University of Göttingen.

GUSTAV BOSSERT, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Retired Pastor, Stuttgart.

FRIEDRICH HEINRICH BRANDES, Th.D.,
Reformed Minister and Chaplain at Bückeburg, Schaumburg-Lippe.

EDUARD BRATKE (†), Ph.D.,
Late Professor of Church History, University of Breslau.

CHARLES AUGUSTUS BRIGGS, D.D., Litt.D.,
Professor of Theological Encyclopedia and Symbolics, Union Theological Seminary, New York.

JOHN BROWNE (†),
Late Pastor at Rentham, Suffolk Co., England.

OSKAR GOTTLIEB RUDOLF BUDDENSIEG (†), Ph.D.,
Late Director of the Teachers' Seminary in Dresden.

FRANTS PEDER WILLIAM BUHL, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Semitic Languages, University of Copenhagen.

KARL BURGER (†), Th.D.,
Late Supreme Consistorial Councilor in Munich.

JOHN KENNEDY CAMERON, M.A.,
Professor of Systematic Theology, Free Church College, Edinburgh.

HUBERT CARLETON, M.A.,
Editor of *St. Andrew's Cross* and General Secretary of the Brotherhood of St. Andrew, Boston.

HEREWARD CARRINGTON,
Writer on Psychical Research.

HENRY KING CARROLL, LL.D.,
Secretary of Executive Committee of the Western Section for the Fourth Ecumenical Methodist Conference.

WALTER AUGUST ANTON NATHAN CASPARI, Ph.D., Th.D.,
University Preacher and Professor of Practical Theology, University of Erlangen.

JACQUES EUGÈNE CHOISY, Th.D.,
Pastor in Geneva.

FERDINAND COHRS, Th.Lic.,
Consistorial Councilor, Ilfeld, Germany.

LEIGHTON COLEMAN (†), D.D.,
Late Protestant Episcopal Bishop of Delaware.

WILLIAM RUSSELL COLLINS, D.D.,
Professor of Liturgics and Ecclesiastical Polity, Reformed Episcopal Theological Seminary, Philadelphia.

EDWARD TANJORE CORWIN, D.D.,
Church Historian, New Brunswick, New Jersey.

SAMUEL CRAMER, Th.D.,
Professor of the History of Christianity, University of Amsterdam, and Professor of Practical Theology, Mennonite Theological Seminary, Amsterdam.

WILHELM CREIZENACH, Ph.D.,
Professor of German Philology in the University of Cracow.

HERMANN DALTON, Th.D.,
Retired Consistorial Councilor, Berlin.

WILLIAM JOHNSON DARBY, D.D.,
Assistant Secretary of the Board of Education of the Presbyterian Church in the United States.

EDWIN CHARLES DARGAN, D.D., LL.D.,
Pastor of the First Baptist Church, Macon, Georgia.

JOHN D. DAVIS, D.D., LL.D., Ph.D.,
Professor of Oriental and Old Testament Literature, Princeton Theological Seminary.

JULIUS DECKE,
Church Inspector, Breslau.

MORTON DEXTER (†), M.A.,
Late Congregational Clergyman and Author, Boston.

FRIEDRICH CARL OTTO DIBELIUS, Ph.D., Th.Lic.,
Archdeacon at Crossen, Germany.

ERNST VON DOBSCHUETZ, Th.D.,
Professor of New-Testament Exegesis, University of Breslau.

LEONHARD ERNST DORN,
Head Preacher, Nördlingen, Bavaria.

WILLIE KIRKPATRICK DOUGLAS,
Dean of Due West Female College, Due West, S. C.

PAUL GOTTFRIED DREWS, Th.D.,
Professor of Practical Theology, University of Halle.

JAMES FRANCIS DRISCOLL, D.D.,
Pastor of St. Gabriel's, New Rochelle, N. Y.

EMIL EGLI (†), Th.D.,
Late Professor of Church History, University of Zurich.

CHRISTIAN FRIEDRICH DAVID ERDMANN (†), Ph.D., Th.D.,
Late Professor of Church History, University of Breslau.

JOHN YOUNG EVANS, M.A., B.D.,
Professor in Trevecca College, Aberwystwyth, Wales.

JOHN OLUF EVJEN, Ph.D.,
Professor of Theology in Augsburg Theological Seminary, Minneapolis, Minn.

PAUL JOHANNES FICKER, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Church History, Strasburg.

FRITZ FLEINER, Dr.Jur.,
Professor of Law, University of Heidelberg.

ROBERT VERRELL FOSTER, D.D., LL.D.,
Professor of Systematic Theology, Cumberland Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Lebanon, Tenn.

GUSTAV WILHELM FRANK (†), Th.D.,
Late Professor of Dogmatics, Symbolics, and Christian Ethics, University of Vienna.

FRANZ HERMANN FRANK (†), Th.D.,
Late Professor of Theology, University of Erlangen.

EMIL ALBERT FRIEDBERG, Th.D., Dr.Jur.,
Professor of Ecclesiastical, Public, and German Law, University of Leipsic.

WILHELM GERMANN (†), Ph.D.,
Late Superintendent in Schleusingen, Prussian Saxony.

GEORGE WILLIAM GILMORE, M.A.,
Formerly Lecturer on Comparative Religion, Bangor Theological Seminary, Associate Editor of THE NEW SCHAFF-HERZOG ENCYCLOPEDIA.

FRANZ GOERRES, Ph.D.,
Assistant Librarian, University of Bonn.

WILHELM GOETZ, Ph.D.,
Honorary Professor of Geography, Technical High School, and Professor at Military Academy, Munich.

HERMANN FREIHERR VON DER GOLTZ (†), Th.D.,
Late Professor of Dogmatics, University of Berlin.

JAMES ISAAC GOOD, D.D.,
Professor of Reformed Church History and Liturgics, Central Theological Seminary, Dayton, Ohio.

WILLIAM ELLIOT GRIFFIS, D.D., L.H.D.,
Author and Lecturer on Historical Subjects, Ithaca, N. Y.

PAUL GRUENBERG, Th.D.,
Pastor in Strasburg.

CARL VON GRUENEISEN (†), D.D.,
Late Court Preacher in Stuttgart.

GEORG GRUETZMACHER, Ph.D., Th.Lic.,
Extraordinary Professor of Church History, University of Heidelberg.

RICHARD HEINRICH GRUETZMACHER, Th.D.,
Professor of Systematic Theology, University of Rostock.

HERMANN GUTHE, Th.D.,
Professor of Old-Testament Exegesis, University of Leipsic.

ARTHUR CRAWSHAY ALLISTON HALL, D.D., LL.D.,
Protestant Episcopal Bishop of Vermont.

ADOLF HARNACK, Ph.D., Th.D., Dr. Jur., M.D.,
General Director of the Royal Library, Berlin.

ALBERT HAUCK, Ph.D., Th.D., Dr. Jur.,
Professor of Church History, University of Leipsic, Editor-in-Chief of the Hauck-Herzog *Realencyklopädie.*

JOHANNES HAUSSLEITER, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Consistorial Councilor, Professor of New-Testament Theology and Exegesis, University of Greifswald.

CARL FRIEDRICH GEORG HEINRICI, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of New-Testament Exegesis, University of Leipsic.

MAX HEINZE (†), Ph.D., Th.D.,
Late Professor of Philosophy, University of Leipsic.

LUDWIG THEODOR EDGAR HENNECKE, Ph.D., Th.Lic.,
Pastor at Betheln, Hanover.

WILHELM HERRMANN, Ph.D., Th.D., Dr.Jur.,
Professor of Systematic Theology, University of Marburg.

JOHANN JAKOB HERZOG (†), Ph.D., Th.D.,
Late Professor of Reformed Theology, University of Erlangen.

RICHARD MORSE HODGE, D.D.,
Lecturer in Biblical Literature, Teachers' College, New York City.

GUSTAV HOENNICKE, Ph.D., Th.Lic.,
Privat-docent in New-Testament Exegesis, University of Berlin.

OSWALD HOLDER-EGGER, Ph.D.,
Professor at Berlin and Director for the Publication of the *Monumenta Germaniæ Historica.*

WILHELM HOELSCHER, Th.D.,
Pastor of St. Nicolaikirche, Leipsic.

ERNST IDELER,
Pastor at Ahrensdorf, near Potsdam.

JOHANN FRIEDRICH IKEN (†),
Late Pastor in Bremen.

HEINRICH FRANZ JACOBSON (†), Ph.D.,
Late Professor of Law, University of Königsberg.

FERDINAND FRIEDRICH WILHELM KATTENBUSCH, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Dogmatics, University of Halle.

PETER GUSTAV KAWERAU, Th.D.,
Consistorial Councilor, Professor of Practical Theology, and University Preacher, University f Breslau.

OTTO KIRN, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Dogmatics, University of Leipsic.

RUDOLF KITTEL, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Old-Testament Exegesis, University of Leipsic.

KARL RUDOLF KLOSE (†), Th.D.,
Late Secretary of the Library, Hamburg.

EDWARD HOOKER KNIGHT, D.D.,
Dean of the Hartford School of Religious Pedagogy, Hartford, Conn.

JUSTUS ADOLF KOEBERLE (†), Th.D.,
Late Professor of the Old Testament, University of Rostock.

HEINRICH ADOLF KOESTLIN (†), Ph.D., Th.D.,
Late Privy Councilor in Cannstadt, formerly Professor of Theology, University of Giessen.

CHRISTOPH FRIEDRICH ADOLF KOLB, Th.D.,
Prelate and Court Preacher, Ludwigsburg.

THEODOR FRIEDRICH HERMANN KOLDE, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Church History, University of Erlangen.

HERMANN GUSTAV EDUARD KRUEGER, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Church History, University of Giessen.

JOHANNES WILHELM KUNZE, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Systematic and Practical Theology, University of Greifswald.

EUGEN LACHENMANN,
City Pastor, Leonberg, Württemberg.

LUDWIG LEMME, Th.D.,
Professor of Systematic Theology, University of Heidelberg.

ORLANDO FAULKLAND LEWIS,
Corresponding Secretary of the Prison Association and Secretary of the Finance Committee of the Charity Organization Society, New York.

FRIEDRICH LEZIUS, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Church History, University of Königsberg.

FRIEDRICH LIST (†), Ph.D.,
Late Studiendirektor, Munich.

PAUL LOBSTEIN, Th.D.,
Professor of Systematic Theology, University of Strasburg.

GEORG LOESCHE, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Church History, Evangelical Theological Faculty, University of Vienna.

FRIEDRICH ARMIN LOOFS, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Church History, University of Halle.

WILLIAM JAMES LOWE, D.D.,
Clerk of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland.

JOHN LYND, D.D.,
Professor of Hebrew and Biblical Criticism, Theological Hall of the Reformed Presbyterian Synod, Belfast.

SAMUEL McCOMB, D.D.,
Pastor of Emmanuel Church, Boston, Mass.

JOHN McDONALD, M.A., B.D.,
Clerk of the Reformed Presbyterian Synod in Scotland.

GEORGE DUNCAN MATHEWS,
General Secretary of the Presbyterian Alliance, London.

PAUL MEHLHORN, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Pastor of the Reformed Church, Leipsic.

OTTO MEJER (†), Ph.D., Th.D.,
Late President of the Consistory, Hanover.

PHILIPP MEYER, Th.D.,
Supreme Consistorial Councilor, Hanover.

CARL THEODOR MIRBT, Th.D.,
Professor of Church History, University of Marburg.

ROBERT MORTON,
Professor of Systematic Theology and Church History in Original Secession Theological Hall, Glasgow, Scotland.

ERNST FRIEDRICH KARL MUELLER, Th.D.,
Professor of Reformed Theology, University of Erlangen.

GEORG MUELLER, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Inspector of Schools, Leipsic.

PEARSON M'ADAM MUIR, D.D.,
Minister of Glasgow Cathedral, Glasgow, Scotland.

HENRY SYLVESTER NASH, D.D.,
Professor of the Literature and Interpretation of the New Testament, Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Mass.

CHRISTOF EBERHARD NESTLE, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor in the Theological Seminary, Maulbronn, Württemberg.

ALBERT HENRY NEWMAN, D.D., LL.D.,
Professor of Church History, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Fort Worth, Texas.

FREDERICK KRISTIAN NIELSEN (†), D.D.,
Late Bishop of Aarhus, Denmark.

CONRAD VON ORELLI, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Old-Testament Exegesis and History of Religion, University of Basel.

CARL PFENDER,
Pastor of St. Paul's Evangelical Lutheran Church, Paris.

FERDINAND PHILIPPI (†), Th.D.,
Late Pastor in Hohenkirchen, Mecklenburg.

FINIS HOMER PRENDERGAST,
Attorney, Marshall, Texas.

ERWIN PREUSCHEN, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Pastor at Hirschhorn-on-the-Neckar, Germany.

RICHARD CLARK REED, D.D., LL.D.,
Professor of Church History in Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Columbia, S. C.

JOSEPH REINKENS (†), Ph.D.,
Late Professor in Cologne.

ROBERT THOMAS ROBERTS, D.D.,
Pastor First Welsh Presbyterian Church, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

WILLIAM HENRY ROBERTS, D.D., LL.D.,
Stated Clerk of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A.

HENDRIK CORNELIS ROGGE (†), Ph.D.,
Late Professor of History, University of Haarlem.

ARNOLD RÜEGG,
Pastor at Birmensdorf and Lecturer at the University of Zurich, Switzerland.

CARL SCHAARSCHMIDT,
Honorary Professor of Philosophy, University of Bonn.

ERICH SCHAEDER, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Systematic Theology, University of Kiel.

THEODOR SCHAEFER, Th.D.,
Head of the Deaconess Institute, Altona.

DAVID SCHLEY SCHAFF, D.D.,
Professor of Church History, Western Theological Seminary, Pittsburg, Pa.

PHILIP SCHAFF (†), D.D., LL.D.,
Late Professor of Church History, Union Theological Seminary, New York, and Editor of the Original SCHAFF-HERZOG ENCYCLOPEDIA.

MARTIN SCHIAN, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Theology, University of Giessen.

REINHOLD SCHMID, Th.Lic.,
Pastor in Oberholzheim, Württemberg.

MAXIMILIAN VICTOR SCHULTZE, Th.D.,
Professor of Church History and Christian Archeology, University of Greifswald.

LUDWIG THEODOR SCHULZE, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Systematic Theology, University of Rostock.

JOHN CRAWFORD SCOULLER, D.D.,
Corresponding Secretary of Board of Ministerial Relief, United Presbyterian Church of North America.

EMIL SECKEL, Dr.Jur.,
Professor of Law, University of Berlin.

EMIL SEHLING, Dr.Jur.,
Professor of Ecclesiastical and Commercial Law, University of Erlangen.

HENRY CLAY SHELDON, D.D.,
Professor of Systematic Theology, Boston University.

FRIEDRICH ANTON EMIL SIEFFERT, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of New-Testament Exegesis, University of Bonn.

JULIUS WILHELM SMEND, Th.D.,
Professor of Systematic and Practical Theology in the Evangelical Theological Faculty, University of Strasburg.

JOHN SOMERVILLE, D.D.,
Clerk of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada.

ROBERT MACGOWAN SOMMERVILLE,
Editor of *Olive Trees*, New York City.

GEORG STEINDORFF, Ph.D.,
Professor of Egyptology, University of Leipsic.

ROBERT WILLIAM STEWART, B.Sc., B.D.,
Glasgow, Scotland.

HERMANN LEBERECHT STRACK, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Extraordinary Professor of Old-Testament Exegesis and Semitic Languages, University of Berlin.

ULRICH STUTZ, Dr.Jur.,
Professor of German and Ecclesiastical Law, University of Bonn.

ROBERT BREWSTER TAGGART,
Vineland, N. J.

CHARLES FRANKLIN THWING, LL.D.,
President of Western Reserve University and Adalbert College, Cleveland.

PAUL TSCHACKERT, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Church History, University of Göttingen.

SIETSE DOUWES VAN VEEN, Th.D.,
Professor of Church History and Christian Archeology, University of Utrecht.

JULIUS AUGUST WAGENMANN (†),
Late Consistorial Councilor, Göttingen.

BENJAMIN BRECKINRIDGE WARFIELD, D.D., LL.D.,
Professor of Didactic and Polemical Theology, Princeton Theological Seminary.

EDWARD ELIHU WHITFIELD, M.A.,
Retired Public Schoolmaster, London.

FRIEDRICH LUDWIG LEONHARD WIEGAND, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Professor of Church History, University of Greifswald.

PAUL WOLFF (†),
Late Pastor at Friedersdorf, Brandenburg, and Editor of the *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung*.

AUGUST WUENSCHE, Ph.D., Th.D.,
Retired Titular Professor in Dresden.

CLARENCE ANDREW YOUNG, Ph.D.,
Pastor, Third Reformed Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, Pa.

FRANZ THEODOR RITTER VON ZAHN, Th.D., Litt.D.,
Professor of New-Testament Exegesis and Introduction, University of Erlangen.

OTTO ZOECKLER (†), Ph.D., Th.D.,
Late Professor of Church History and Apologetics, University of Greifswald.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL APPENDIX—VOLS. I—IX

The following list of books is supplementary to the bibliographies given at the end of the articles contained in volumes I.–IX., and brings the literature down to November, 1910. In this list each title entry is printed in capital letters. It is to be noted that, throughout the work, in the articles as a rule only first editions are given. In the bibliographies the aim is to give either the best or the latest edition, and in case the book is published both in America and in some other country, the American place of issue is usually given the preference.

ABBOTT, L.: *Seeking after God*, New York, 1910.

ALTAR: A. Hartel, *Altars and Pulpits; a Series of Examples of Ecclesiastical Work in the Gothic Style, taken mostly from the famous German Cathedrals and Churches of the Middle Ages*, 3d ed., New York, 1910.

AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS: *Rerum gestarum libri qui supersunt*, ed. C. U. Clark, L. Traube, and G. Heræus, vol. 1, *libri XIV.–XXV.*, Berlin, 1910.

APOLOGETICS: A. Kirchner, *Die babylonische Kosmogonie und der biblische Schöpfungsbericht. Ein Beitrag zur Apologie des biblischen Gottesbegriffes*, Münster, 1910.

A. R. Wells, *Why we believe the Bible; Outlines of Christian Evidences in Question and Answer Form*, Boston, 1910.

ARMENIA: M. Ormanian, *L'Église arménienne, son histoire, sa doctrine, son régime, sa discipline, sa liturgie, sa littérature, son present*, Paris, 1910.

ATHANASIAN CREED: T. N. Papaconstantinos, *The Creed of Athanasius the Great*, translated by H. C. J. Lingham, London, 1910.

ATONEMENT: J. B. Champion, *The Living Atonement*, Philadelphia, 1910.

AVITUS: H. Goelzer and A. Mey, *Le Latin de Saint Avit évêque de Vienne (450–526)*, Paris, 1909.

BABYLONIA: F. Delitzsch, *Handel und Wandel in Altbabylonien*, Stuttgart, 1910.

D. W. Myhrman, *Sumerian Administrative Documents, dated in the Reigns of the Kings of the second Dynasty of Ur, from the Temple Archives of Nippur, preserved in Philadelphia*, Philadelphia, 1910.

BACHER, W.: L. Blau, *Bibliographie der Schriften Wilhelm Bachers nebst einem hebräischen Sach- und Ortsnamen Register zu seinem sechsbändigen Agadwerke*, Frankfort, 1910.

BALLARD, A.: *From Text to Talk*, Boston, 1910.

BAMPTON LECTURES: W. Hobhouse, *The Church and the World in Idea and in History*, New York, 1910.

BAPTISTS: *Seventh Day Baptists in Europe and America; a Series of Historical Papers written in Commemoration of the 100th Anniversary of the Organization of the Seventh Day Baptist General Conference, celebrated at Ashaway, Rhode Island, Aug. 20–25, 1902*, 2 vols., Plainfield, N. J., 1910.

BARNES, W. E.: *Lex in Corde: Studies in the Psalter*, London, 1910.

BAUR, F. C.: E. Schneider, *F. C. Baur in seiner Bedeutung für die Theologie*, Munich, 1909.

BECKET, T.: W. H. Hatton, *Thomas Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury*, London, 1910.

BEDE: *Lives of the First Five Abbots of Wearmouth and Yarrow*, London, 1910.

BIBLE SOCIETIES: *A Popular Illustrated Report of the British and Foreign Bible Society*, 1909–10, London, 1910.

BENEDICT XIV.: Add to bibliography *Heroic Virtue; a Portion of the Treatise of Benedict XIV on the Beatification and Canonization of the Servants of God*, 3 vols., London, 1850.

BIBLE TEXT: A. B. Ehrlich, *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel. Textkritisches, Sprachliches und Sachliches.* Erster Band: *Genesis und Exodus.* Zweiter Band: *Leviticus, Numeri, Deuteronomium*, Leipsic, 1908–1909.

H. H. Josten, *Neue Studien zur Evangelienhandschrift.* No. 18, *Des heiligen Bernward Evangelienbuch im Domschatz zu Hildesheim*, Strasburg, 1909.

Agnes Smith Lewis, *Old Syriac Gospels, or Evangelion Damepharreshê*, London, 1910.

H. F. von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt hergestellt auf Grund ihrer Textgeschichte*, Berlin, 1906–10.

BIBLE VERSIONS: W. J. Heaton, *The Bible of the Reformation: its Translators and their Work*, London, 1910.

J. P. Hentz, *History of the Lutheran version of the Bible*, Dayton, O., 1910.

S. McComb, *The Making of the English Bible*, London, 1910.

BIBLICAL CRITICISM: A. Duff, *History of Old Testament Criticism*, New York, 1910.

T. Engert, *Das Alte Testament im Lichte modern-istisch-katholischer Wissenschaft*, Munich, 1910.

BIBLICAL INTRODUCTION: A. C. Robinson, *What about the Old Testament? Is it played out?* London, 1910.

BIBLICAL THEOLOGY: E. von Dobschütz, *The Eschatology of the Gospels*, London, 1910.

P. Karge, *Geschichte des Bundesgedankens im Alten Testament*, Münster, 1910.

A. F Loisy: see below.

C. G. Montefiore, *Some Elements of the Religious Teaching of Jesus According to the Synoptic Gospels* (Jowett Lectures, 1910), London, 1910.

BIBLICAL THEOLOGY: L. B. Paton, *The Early Religion of Israel*, Boston, 1910.
A. Schlatter, *Die Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, vol. ii., *Die Lehre der Apostel*, Calw and Stuttgart, 1909–10.
H. B. Swete, *Studies in the Teachings of our Lord*, London, 1910.

BONIFACE: G. F. Browne, *Bonifacc and his Companions*, London, 1910.

BRAHMANISM: *The Parisistas of the Atharvaveda*. Ed. G. M. Bolling and J. von Negelein, Leipsic, 1910.
A. Roussel, *La Religion védique*, Paris, 1910.

BUDDHISM: *Alphabetical List of the Titles of Works in the Chinese Buddhist Tripitaka* (Archeological Dept. of India). *Being an Index to Bunyin Nanjio's Catalogue and the 1905 Kioto Reprint of the Buddhist Canon*. Prepared by E. Denison Ross, Bombay, 1910.
H. Oldenburg, *Aus dem alten Indien. 3 Aufsätze über den Buddhismus, alt-indische Dichtung und Geschichtschreibung*, Berlin, 1910.

BURMA: A. Bunker, *Sketches from the Karen Hills*, New York, 1910.
Shway Yor, *The Burman, his Life and Notions*, London, 1910.

CANONIZATION: Add to bibliography the work given above under Benedict XIV Also A. Boudinhon, *Les Procès de beatification et de canonisation*, Paris, 1908.
T. F. Macken, *The Canonization of Saints*, Dublin, 1910.

CHINA: *China and the Gospel. An Illustrated Report of the China Inland Mission*, London, 1910.
E. Chavannes, *Le T'ai Chan. Essai de monographie d'un culte chinois*. Appendice: *Le Dieu du sol dans la chine antique*, Paris, 1910.
E. H. Parker, *Studies in Chinese Religion*, London, 1910.

CHURCH: W Hobhouse, *The Church and the World in Idea and History*, London, 1910.
F. I. Paradise, *The Church and the Individual*, New York, 1910.

CHURCH HISTORY: J. Felten, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte oder Judentum und Heidentum zur Zeit Christi und der Apostel*, 2 vols., Regensburg, 1910.
F. X. Funk, *A Manual of Church History*, vol. ii., London, 1910.
S. Lublinski, *Der urchristliche Erdkreis und sein Mythos*, vol. i., *Die Entstehung des Christentums aus der antiken Kultur*, Jena, 1910.

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA: J. Gabrielsson, *Ueber die Quellen des Clemens Alexandrinus*, vol. ii., *Zur genaueren Prüfung der Favorinushypothese*, Leipsic, 1909.

COLOGNE: W. Pelster, *Stand und Herkunft der Bischöfe der Kölner Kirchenprovinz im Mittelalter*, Weimar, 1909.

COMMON PRAYER, BOOK OF: N. Dimock, *The History of the Book of Common Prayer in its Bearing on Present Eucharistic Controversies*, London and New York, 1910.

COMPARATIVE RELIGION: E. S. Ames, *The Psychology of Religious Experience*, Boston, 1910.
A. S. Bishop, *The World's Altar-Stairs in the Religions of the World*, London, 1910.
C. C. Martindale, ed., *Lectures on the History of Religions*, St. Louis, 1910.
R. M. Meyer, *Altgermanische Religionsgeschichte*, Leipsic, 1910.
R. Quanter, *Das Weib in den Religionen der Völker unter Berücksichtigung der einzelnen Kulte. Mit vielen zeitgenossischen Illlustrationen*, Berlin, 1910.
J. H. Randall and J. G. Smith, *The Unity of Religions; a popular Discussion of ancient and modern Beliefs*, New York, 1910.
J. Schrijnen, *Essays en studien in vergelijkende Godsdienstgeschiedenis, Mythologie en Folklore*, Venlao, 1910.

CONGREGATIONALISTS: A. F. Beard, *A Crusade of Brotherhood. History of the American Missionary Association*, Boston, 1909.

COPTIC CHURCH: E. A. W Budge, *Coptic Homilies in the Dialect of Upper Egypt, ed. from the Papyrus Codex Oriental 5001, in the British Museum*, London, 1910.

COUNCILS AND SYNODS: F. Schulthess, *Die syrischen Kanones der Synoden von Nicæa bis Chalcedon nebst einigen zugehörigen Dokumenten*, Berlin, 1908.

CRUSADES: W. S. Durrant, *Cross and Dagger: the Crusade of the Children*, London, 1910.

CURIA: F. Russo, *La curia romana nella sua organizzione e nel suo completo funzionamento a datare dal 3 novembre, 1908*, Palermo, 1910.

DAWSON, W. J.: *The Divine Challenge*, New York and London, 1910.

DEISSMANN, A.: *Light from the Ancient East. The New Testament*. Translation by L. R. M. Strachan, London, 1910.

DOCTRINE, HISTORY OF: P. Tschackert, *Die Entstehung der lutherischen und der reformierten Kirchenlehre samst ihren inneren protestantischen Gegensätzen*, Göttingen, 1910.

DOGMA, DOGMATICS: G. R. Montgomery, *The Unexplored Self; an Introductory to Christian Doctrine for Teachers and Students*, New York, 1910.

EGYPT: W. M. F. Petrie, *Arts and Crafts of Ancient Egypt*, Chicago, 1910.
P. Virey, *La Religion de l'Ancienne Egypte*, Paris, 1910.

EGYPTIAN EXPLORATION FUND: Thirtieth Memoir. *The XI. Dynasty Temple at Deir-el Bahiri*, Part 2 by E. Naville, London, 1910.

ENGLAND, CHURCH OF: C. S. Carter, *The English Church in the Eighteenth Century*, London and New York, 1910.
F. W. Cornish, *The English Church in the 19th Century*, 2 parts, London, 1910.
F. A. Hibbert, *The Dissolution of the Monasteries, as Illustrated by the Suppression of the Religious Houses of Staffordshire*, London, 1910.
E. Stock, *The English Church in the Nineteenth Century*, London and New York, 1910.

EPIKLESIS: P. M. Chaine, *La Consécration et l'épiclèse dans le missal éthiopien*, Rome, 1910.

EPISCOPATE: R. E. Thompson, *The Historic Episcopate*, Philadelphia, 1910.

ERASMUS: A. Meyer, *Étude critique sur les relations d'Érasme et de Luther*, Paris, 1909.

ESCHATOLOGY: See above, BIBLICAL THEOLOGY.

ETHICS: T. C. Hall, *History of Ethics within Organized Christianity*, New York, 1910.

EUDES, J.: M. Russell, *The Life of Blessed John Eudes*, London, 1910.

EZRA AND NEHEMIAH: G. Klamath, *Ezras Leben und Wirken*, Vienna, 1908.
J. Heis, *Geschichtliche und literärkritische Fragen in Esra 1–6*, Münster, 1909.

FRANCE: R. P. Lecanuet, *L'Église de France sous la troisième republique. Pontificat de Léon XIII. (1878–1903)*, Paris, 1910.

GALILEE: A. Resch, *Das Galiläa bei Jerusalem. Eine biblische Studie*, Leipsic, 1910.

GALILEO: E. Wohlwill, *Galilei und sein Kampf für die copernicanische Lehre*, Hamburg, 1909.

GNOSTICISM: W. Schultz, *Dokumente der Gnosis*, Jena, 1910.

GOD: J. A. Hall, *The Nature of God*, Philadelphia, 1910.

GOSPEL: F. C. Burkitt, *The Earliest Sources for the Life of Jesus*, Boston, 1910.

F. K. Feigel, *Der Einschluss des Weissagungsbeweises und anderer Motive auf die Leidensgeschichte. Ein Beitrag zur Evangelienkritik*, Tübingen, 1910.

W. M. F. Petrie, *The Growth of the Gospels as shown by Scriptural Criticism*, London, 1910.

GUNKEL, H.: *Genesis*, 3d ed., Göttingen, 1910.

HAGENBACH, K. R.: *Ihr Briefwechsel aus den Jahren 1841 bis 1851*, Basel, 1910.

HALL, T. C.: See above, ETHICS.

HANNINGTON, J.: C. D. Michael, *James Hannington, Bishop and Martyr*, London, 1910.

HARMONIES: A. R. Whitham, *The Life of Our Blessed Lord. From the Revised Version of the Four Gospels. The Bible Text only.* London, 1910.

HEBREWS: F. Dibelius, *Der Verfasser des Hebräerbriefes. Eine Untersuchung zur Geschichte des Urchristentums*, Strasburg, 1910.

HELLENISM: P. Hauser, *Les Grecs et les sémites dans l'histoire de l'humanité*, Paris, 1910.

HELLENISTIC GREEK: G. Milligan, *Selections from the Greek Papyri, ed. with Transl. and Notes*, London, 1910.

HEXATEUCH: See above, GUNKEL.

G. Hoberg, *Die Genesis nach dem Literalsinn erklärt*, Freiburg, 1908.

Leviticus and Numbers. Introduction; in the *Century Bible*, ed. A. R. S. Kennedy, London, 1910.

HITTITES: J. Garstang, *The Land of the Hittites; an Account of the recent Explorations and Discoveries in Asia Minor; Introduction by A. H. Sayce*, New York, 1910.

HOLLAND, H. S.: *Fibres of Faith*, London, 1910.

HOLY SPIRIT: R. A. Torrey, *The Person and Work of the Holy Spirit*, London, 1910.

HUSS, J.: E. J. Kitts, *Pope John the Twenty-third, and Master John Hus of Bohemia*, London, 1910.

HYMNOLOGY: J. Duncan, *Popular Hymns, their Authors and Teaching*, London, 1910.

IDEALISM: E. W. Lyman, *Theology and Human Problems; a comparative Study of absolute Idealism and Pragmatism as Interpreters of Religion*, New York, 1910.

IMMORTALITY: S. H. Mellone, *The Immortal Hope. Present Aspects of the Problem of Immortality*, London, 1910.

J. Paterson Smyth, *The Gospel of the Hereafter*, New York and Chicago, 1910.

INDIANS OF NORTH AMERICA: *David Zeisberger's History of Northern American Indians;* ed. A. B. Hulbert and W N. Schwarze, Columbus, 1910.

INSPIRATION: W. J. Colville, *Ancient Mysteries and Modern Revelations*, New York, 1910.

INGRAM, A. F. W.: *The Mysteries of God*, London, 1910.

ISAIAH: M. G. Glazebrook, *Studies in the Book of Isaiah*, London, 1910.

G. C. Morgan, *The Prophecy of Isaiah*, 2 vols., London, 1910.

ISRAEL, HISTORY OF: A. Bertholet, *Das Ende des jüdischen Staatswesens*, Tübingen, 1910.

I. Blum, *The Jews of Baltimore; an historical Summary of their Progress and Status as Citizens of Baltimore from early Days to the Year nineteen hundred and ten*, Baltimore, 1910.

L. Lucas, *Zur Geschichte der Juden im vierten Jahrhunderts*, Berlin, 1910.

S. Oppenheim, *The Early History of the Jews in New York, 1654–1664*, New York, 1910.

JAINISM: Manak Chand Jaini, *Life of Mahavira*, London, 1910.

JEFFERSON, C. E.: *The Building of the Church*, New York, 1910.

JEROME: *The First Part of the Epistles*, ed. I. Hilberg, in *CSEL*, vol. liv., Vienna, 1910.

JERUSALEM, ANGLICAN-GERMAN BISHOPRIC IN: Add to the bibliography: *The Jerusalem Bishopric: Documents, with Translations relating thereto, published by Command of H. M. Frederick William IV., of Prussia*, London, 1883.

JESUS CHRIST: P. T. Forsyth, *The Work of Christ*, London, 1910.

F. X. Steinmeyer, *Die Geschichte der Geburt und Kindheit Christi und ihr Verhältnis zur babylonischen Mythe*, Münster, 1910.

J. Weiss, *Jesus von Nazareth Mythus oder Geschichte?* Tübingen, 1910.

JOHN THE APOSTLE: G. S. Barrett, *The First Epistle General of St. John. A Devotional Commentary*, London, 1910.

Westminster New Testament. The Revelation and the Johannine Epistles. Introduction and Notes by Rev. A. Ramsay, London, 1910.

M. Seisenberger, *Erklärung des Johannesevangeliums*, Regensburg, 1910.

JOHN OF EPHESUS: *Extracts from the Ecclesiastical History, ed. with grammatical, historical and geographical Notes by J. P. Margoliouth*, Leyden, 1910.

JOHN XXIII.: See HUSS, JOHN, above.

KEMPIS, THOMAS A: *Concordance to the Latin Original of the Four Books known as De Imitatione Christi, Given to the World A.D. 1441 by Thomas à Kempis. Comp. by R. Storr*, London, 1910.

KIERKEGAARD, S. A.: R. Hoffmann, *Kierkegaard und die religiöse Gewissheit*, Göttingen, 1910.

LOCKE, J.: E. Crous, *Die religions-philosophischen Lehren Lockes und ihre Stellung zu dem Deismus seiner Zeit*, Halle, 1910.

LOISY, A. F.: *The Religion of Israel*, London, 1910.

LOISY, M.: M. Lepin, *Les Théories de M. Loisy*, Paris, 1908.

MCFADYEN, J. E.: *The Way of Prayer*, Boston, 1910.

MCGIFFERT, A. C.: *History of Christian Thought from the Reformation to Kant*, London, 1910.

MANICHEANS: *Chuastuanit, das Bussgebet der Manichäer*, ed. with German Transl. W. Radloff, Leipsic, 1910.

MATHEWS, S.: *A History of New Testament Times in Palestine, 175 B.C.–70 A.D.*, 2d ed., New York, 1910.

METHODISTS: A. Léger, *L'Angleterre religeuse et les origines du méthodisme au xviii. siècle. La Jeunesse de Wesley*, Paris, 1910.
W. Platt, *Methodism and the Republic; a View of the Home Field, present Conditions, Needs, and Possibilities*, Philadelphia, 1910.
W. J. Townsend, H. B. Workman, and G. Eayres, *A New History of Methodism*, 2 vols., London, 1909.

MIRACLES: J. Wendland, *Der Wunderglaube im Christentum*, Göttingen, 1910.

MISSIONS: W H. J. Gairdner, *Edinburgh, 1910. An Account and Interpretation of the World Missionary Conference*, London, 1910.
H. C. Lees, *St. Paul and his Converts, a Series of Studies in Typical New Testament Mission*, London, 1910.
J. J. MacDonald, *The Redeemer's Reign. Foreign Missions and the Second Advent*, ed. G. Smith, London, 1910.
Winifred Heston, *A Blue Stocking in India*, London, 1910 (on medical missionary work).
W E. Strong, *The Story of the American Board; an Account of the first hundred Years of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions*, Boston, 1910.

MODERNISM: R. de Bary, *Franciscan Days of Vigil: a Narrative of personal Views and Developments*, New York, 1910.
D. Mercier (Cardinal), *Modernism*, London, 1910.

MOHAMMED, MOHAMMEDANISM: C. Field, *Mystics and Saints of Islam*, London, 1910.
M. T. Houtsma and A. Schaade, *Enzyklopädie des Islam*, Leyden and Leipsic, 1910.
The Encyclopedia of Islam, part v., London, 1910.
Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Kultur des islamischen Orients, ed. C. H. Becker, begun in Strasburg, 1910.

MORGAN, G. C.: *The Study and Teaching of the English Bible*, London, 1910.

MORMONS: S. W. Traum, *Mormonism against itself*, Cincinnati, 1910.

MOULTON, W F. and Whitley, W. T.: *Studies in Modern Christendom—A Series of Lectures Delivered in Connexion with the Liverpool Board of Biblical Studies, Lent term, 1909*, London, 1910.

MYSTICISM: E. Lehmann, *Mysticism in Heathendom and Christendom*, London, 1910.
The Call of Self-knowledge: seven early English mystical Treatises printed by H. Pepwell in 1521; ed. with an Introd. and Notes by E. G. Gardner, New York, 1910.
A. Poulain, *Die Fülle der Gnaden. Ein Handbuch der Mystik*, 2 parts, Freiburg, 1910.

MYTHOLOGY: P. Ehrenreich, *Die allgemeine Mythologie und ihre ethnologischen Grundlagen*, Leipsic, 1910.
J. E. Hanauer, *Folk-lore of the Holy Land, Moslem, Christian, and Jewish*, ed. M. Pickthall, London, 1910.

NAVILLE, E.: See EGYPTIAN EXPLORATION FUND.

NEOPLATONISM: K. S. Guthrie, *The Philosophy of Plotinus; his Life, Times, and Philosophy* (bound with this: *Selections from Plotinus' Enneads*), Philadelphia, 1910.

NESTORIANS: *Histoire Nestorienne (Chronique de Séert)*. Part I. *Texte Arabe, ed. Addai Scher, traduit par P. Dib*, Paris, 1910.

NESTORIUS: L. Fendt, *Die Christologie des Nestorius*, Kempten, 1910.

NEW THOUGHT: Ella Wheeler Wilcox, *New Thought Common Sense and What Life Means to Me*, London, 1910.

NICHOLAS I.: A. Greinacher, *Die Anschauungen des Papstes Nikolaus I. über das Verhältnis von Staat und Kirche*, Berlin, 1909.

NIETZSCHE, F.: H. Belart, *Friedrich Nietzsches Leben*, Berlin, 1910.
J. M. Kennedy, *The Quintessence of Nietzsche*, New York, 1910.
A. M. Ludovici, *Nietzsche: his Life and Works*, London, 1910.

PAPYRUS AND PAPYRI: G. A. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East: the New Testament and the new and recently discovered Manuscripts of the Græco-Roman World*, New York, 1910.

PASSOVER: C. Howard, *The Passover: an Interpretation*, New York, 1910.

PASTORAL THEOLOGY: C. Durand Pallot, *La Cure d'âme moderne et ses bases religieuses et scientifiques*, Paris, 1910.

PATON, L. B.: See above, BIBLICAL THEOLOGY.

PAUL THE APOSTLE: H. Lietzmann, *Die Briefe des Apostels Paulus. I., Die vier Hauptbriefe*, Tübingen, 1910.
J. Strachan, *The Captivity and Pastoral Epistles*, New York and Chicago, 1910.
A. L. Williams, *Epistle to the Galatians*, London, 1910.
H. L. Yorke, *The Law of the Spirit. Studies in the Epistle to the Philippians*, London, 1910.

PHILO: L. Cohn, *Die Werke Philos von Alexandria in deutscher Uebersetzung*, Breslau, 1909.

POLITY: A. J. McLean, *The Ancient Church Orders*, London, 1910.

PRAGMATISM: See above, IDEALISM.

PSEUDEPIGRAPHA: W N. Stearns, ed., *Fragments from Græco-Jewish Writers*, Chicago, 1908.
E. Fisserant, *Ascension d'Isaie*, Paris, 1909.
L. Gry, *Les Paraboles d'Hénoch et leur Messianisme*, Paris, 1910.

RESCH: See above, Galilee.

BIOGRAPHICAL ADDENDA

CHOISY, J. E.: Became professor of church history in the University of Geneva, 1910.

DOWDEN, J.: d. at Edinburgh Jan. 30, 1910.

EDDY, M. B. G.: d. at Newton, Mass., Dec. 3, 1910.

FAULHABER, M.: Made bishop of Speyer, 1910.

FLINT, R.: d. at Edinburgh Nov. 25, 1910.

FRIEDBERG, E.: d. at Leipsic Sept. 7, 1910.

GIESEBRECHT, F.: d. at Stettin Aug. 21, 1910.

HOENNICKE, G.: Became extraordinary professor of the New Testament at Breslau, 1910.

HOYT, W.: d. at Salem, Mass., Sept. 27, 1910.

INCE, W.: d. at Oxford Nov. 13, 1910.

JUNCKER, A.: Became professor of the New Testament in Königsberg, 1910.

MACLAGAN, W. D.: d. at London Sept. 19, 1910.

ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA

Vol. i., p. 26, col. 2: Insert " ACRE. See PHENICIA, I., § 1."

Vol. i., p. 413, col. 1: Insert " BACCHUS: Martyr of the fourth century. See SERGIUS AND BACCHUS."

Vol. ii., p. 31, col. 1: Insert " BEIRUT. See PHENICIA, I., § 6."

Vol. ii., p. 256, col. 2, line 21: Read " Beach " for " Reach."

Vol. iii., p. 58, col. 2, line 19: Read " Paine " for " Payne."

Vol. iii., p. 279, col. 1: Insert " COUDRIN, PIERRE MARIE JOSEPH. See PICPUS, CONGREGATION OF."

Vol. iv., p. 46, col. 2, line 11 from bottom: Read " Polycrates of Ephesus " for " Polycarp of Smyrna " (important).

Vol. iv., p. 192, col. 2, line 20: Read " ideals " for " idols."

Vol. v., p. 136, col. 2, line 28: Read " prologue " for " epilogue."

Vol. v., p. 186, col. 2, line 10 from bottom: Read " next " for " text."

Vol. v., p. 235, col. 2, line 14 from bottom: Read lxxi. for " lxvii.", and line 13 from bottom, read " lxxii.," for " lxvii."

Vol. v., p. 322, col. 2, line 23: Read " Hansen " for " Hausen."

Vol. v., p. 336, col. 2: Insert " HOLYOAKE, GEORGE JAMES. See SECULARISM."

Vol. v., p. 412, col. 2, line 11: Read " i." for " xi."

Vol. viii., p. 85, col. 2, line 17 from bottom: Read " Thomson " for " Thomas."

Vol. viii., p. 151, col. 2, line 21: Read " at St. Johns, was erected into a diocese in 1847, and into an archdiocese and metropolitan see in 1904."

Vol. viii., p. 231, col. 2, line 9: Omit " Canadian."

Vol. viii., p. 272, col. 2, line 3: Read " new " for " later."

Vol. viii., p. 300, col. 2, line 6 from bottom: Read " Ricker " for " Rieker."

Vol. viii., p. 358, col. 1, line 13 from bottom: Read " *Clerum* " for " *larum.*"

Vol. viii., p. 393, col. 1, line 3 from bottom: Read " 81 " for " 72 "; bottom line, read " Stuart " for " Stewart "; col. 2, line 2, read " 1884 " for " 1881."

Vol. viii., p. 426, col. 2, line 23 from bottom: Remove " the distinguished lexicographer."

Vol. viii., p. 466, col. 1, lines 4–6: Omit all after " 1879 sqq.)."

Vol. viii., p. 489, col. 2, line 17 from bottom: Remove † from signature.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations in common use or self-evident are not included here. For additional information concerning the works listed, see vol. i., pp. viii.-xx., and the appropriate articles in the body of the work.

ADB	*Allgemeine deutsche Biographie*, Leipsic, 1875 sqq., vol. 53, 1907
Adv	*adversus*, " against "
AJP	*American Journal of Philology*, Baltimore, 1880 sqq.
AJT	*American Journal of Theology*, Chicago, 1897 sqq.
AKR	*Archiv für katholisches Kirchenrecht*, Innsbruck, 1857–61, Mainz, 1872 sqq.
ALKG	*Archiv für Litteratur- und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters*, Freiburg, 1885 sqq.
Am	American
AMA	*Abhandlungen der Münchener Akademie*, Munich, 1763 sqq.
ANF	*Ante-Nicene Fathers*, American edition by A. Cleveland Coxe, 8 vols. and index, Buffalo, 1887; vol. ix., ed. Allan Menzies, New York, 1897
Apoc	Apocrypha, apocryphal
Apol	*Apologia, Apology*
Arab	Arabic
Aram	Aramaic
art	article
Art. Schmal	Schmalkald Articles
ASB	*Acta sanctorum*, ed. J. Bolland and others, Antwerp, 1643 sqq.
ASM	*Acta sanctorum ordinis S. Benedicti*, ed. J. Mabillon, 9 vols., Paris, 1668–1701
Assyr	Assyrian
A. T.	*Altes Testament*, " Old Testament "
Augs. Con	Augsburg Confession
A. V	Authorized Version (of the English Bible)
Baldwin, *Dictionary*	J. M. Baldwin, *Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology*, 3 vols. in 4, New York, 1901–05
Bardenhewer, *Geschichte*	O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Litteratur*, 2 vols., Freiburg, 1902
Bardenhewer, *Patrologie*	O. Bardenhewer, *Patrologie*, 2d ed., Freiburg, 1901
Bayle, *Dictionary*	*The Dictionary Historical and Critical of Mr. Peter Bayle*, 2d ed., 5 vols., London, 1734–38
Benzinger, *Archäologie*	I. Benzinger, *Hebräische Archäologie*, 2d ed., Freiburg, 1907
Bingham, *Origines*	J. Bingham, *Origines ecclesiasticæ*, 10 vols., London, 1708–22; new ed., Oxford, 1855
Bouquet, *Recueil*	M. Bouquet, *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, continued by various hands, 23 vols., Paris, 1738–76
Bower, *Popes*	Archibald Bower, *History of the Popes . . . to 1758, continued by S. H. Cox*, 3 vols., Philadelphia, 1845–47
BQR	*Baptist Quarterly Review*, Philadelphia, 1867 sqq.
BRG	See Jaffé
Cant	Canticles, Song of Solomon
cap	*caput*, " chapter "
Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*	R. Ceillier, *Histoire des auteurs sacrés et ecclésiastiques*, 16 vols. in 17, Paris, 1858–69
Chron	*Chronicon*, " Chronicle "
I Chron	I Chronicles
II Chron	II Chronicles
CIG	*Corpus inscriptionum Græcarum*, Berlin, 1825 sqq.
CIL	*Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum*, Berlin, 1863 sqq.
CIS	*Corpus inscriptionum Semiticarum*, Paris, 1881 sqq.
cod	codex
cod. Theod	*codex Theodosianus*
Col	Epistle to the Colossians
col., cols	column, columns
Conf	*Confessiones*, " Confessions "
I Cor	First Epistle to the Corinthians
II Cor	Second Epistle to the Corinthians
COT	See Schrader
CQR	*The Church Quarterly Review*, London, 1875 sqq.
CR	*Corpus reformatorum*, begun at Halle, 1834, vol. lxxxix., Berlin and Leipsic, 1905 sqq.
Creighton, *Papacy*	M. Creighton, *A History of the Papacy from the Great Schism to the Sack of Rome*, new ed., 6 vols., New York and London, 1897
CSCO	*Corpus scriptorum Christianorum orientalium*, ed. J. B. Chabot, I. Guidi, and others, Paris and Leipsic, 1903 sqq.
CSEL	*Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, Vienna, 1867 sqq.
CSHB	*Corpus scriptorum historiæ Byzantinæ*, 49 vols., Bonn, 1828–78
Currier, *Religious Orders*	C. W. Currier, *History of Religious Orders*, New York, 1896
D	Deuteronomist
Dan	Daniel
DB	J. Hastings, *Dictionary of the Bible*, 4 vols. and extra vol., Edinburgh and New York, 1898–1904
DCA	W. Smith and S. Cheetham, *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, 2 vols., London, 1875–80
DCB	W. Smith and H. Wace, *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, 4 vols., Boston, 1877–87
DCG	J. Hastings, J. A. Selbie, and J. C. Lambert, *A Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, 2 vols., Edinburgh and New York, 1906–1908
Deut	Deuteronomy
De vir. ill	*De viris illustribus*
DGQ	See Wattenbach
DNB	L. Stephen and S. Lee, *Dictionary of National Biography*, 63 vols. and supplement 3 vols., London, 1885–1901
Driver, *Introduction*	S. R. Driver, *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, 10th ed., New York, 1910
E	Elohist
EB	T. K. Cheyne and J. S. Black, *Encyclopædia Biblica*, 4 vols., London and New York, 1899–1903
Eccl.	*Ecclesia*, " Church "; *ecclesiasticus*, " ecclesiastical "
Eccles	Ecclesiastes
Ecclus	Ecclesiasticus
ed	edition; *edidit*, " edited by "
Eph	Epistle to the Ephesians
Epist	*Epistola, Epistolæ*, " Epistle," " Epistles "
Ersch and Gruber, *Encyklopädie*	J. S. Ersch and J. G. Gruber, *Allgemeine Encyklopädie der Wissenschaften und Künste*, Leipsic, 1818 sqq.
E. V	English versions (of the Bible)
Ex	Exodus
Ezek	Ezekiel
fasc	fasciculus
Fr	French
Friedrich, *KD*	J. Friedrich, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, 2 vols., Bamberg, 1867–69
Gal	Epistle to the Galatians
Gams, *Series episcoporum*	P. B. Gams, *Series episcoporum ecclesiæ Catholicæ*, Regensburg, 1873, and supplement, 1886
Gee and Hardy, *Documents*	H. Gee and W. J. Hardy, *Documents Illustrative of English Church History*, London, 1896
Germ	German
GGA	*Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen*, Göttingen, 1824 sqq.
Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*	E. Gibbon, *History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ed. J. B. Bury, 7 vols., London, 1896–1900
Gk	Greek
Gross, *Sources*	C. Gross, *The Sources and Literature of English History to 1485*, London, 1900
Hab	Habakkuk
Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*	A. W. Haddan and W. Stubbs, *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents Relating to Great Britain and Ireland*, 3 vols., Oxford, 1869–78

Hær	Refers to patristic works on heresies or heretics, Tertullian's *De præscriptione*, the *Pros haireseis* of Irenæus, the *Panarion* of Epiphanius, etc.
Hag	Haggai
Harduin, *Concilia*	J. Harduin, *Conciliorum collectio regia maxima*, 12 vols., Paris, 1715
Harnack, *Dogma*	A. Harnack, *History of Dogma . . . from the 3d German edition*, 7 vols., Boston, 1895–1900
Harnack, *Litteratur*	A. Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius*, 2 vols. in 3, Leipsic, 1893–1904
Hauck, *KD*	A. Hauck, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, vol. i., Leipsic, 1904; vol. ii., 1900; vol. iii., 1906; vol. iv., 1903
Hauck-Herzog, *RE*	*Realenckylopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, founded by J. J. Herzog, 3d ed. by A. Hauck, Leipsic, 1896–1909
Heb	Epistle to the Hebrews
Hebr	Hebrew
Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*	C. J. von Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, continued by J. Hergenröther, vols. i.–vi., viii.–ix., Freiburg, 1883–93
Heimbucher, *Orden und Kongregationen*	M. Heimbucher, *Die Orden und Kongregationen der katholischen Kirche*, 2d ed. 3 vols., Paderborn, 1907
Helyot, *Ordres monastiques*	P. Helyot, *Histoire des ordres monastiques, religieux et militaires*, 8 vols., Paris, 1714–19; new ed., 1839–42
Henderson, *Documents*	E. F. Henderson, *Select Historical Documents of the Middle Ages*, London, 1892
Hist	History, *histoire, historia*
Hist. eccl.	*Historia ecclesiastica, ecclesiæ*, "Church History"
Hom	*Homilia, homiliai*, "homily, homilies"
Hos	Hosea
Isa	Isaiah
Ital	Italian
J	Jahvist (Yahwist)
JA	*Journal Asiatique*, Paris, 1822 sqq.
Jacobus, *Dictionary*	*A Standard Bible Dictionary*, ed. M. W. Jacobus, . . E. E. Nourse, . . . and A. C. Zenos, New York and London, 1909
Jaffé, *BRG*	P. Jaffé, *Bibliotheca rerum Germanicarum*, 6 vols., Berlin, 1864–73
Jaffé, *Regesta*	P. Jaffé, *Regesta pontificum Romanorum . . . ad annum 1198*, Berlin, 1851; 2d ed., Leipsic, 1881–88
JAOS	*Journal of the American Oriental Society*, New Haven, 1849 sqq.
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature and Exegesis*, first appeared as *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis*, Middletown, 1882–88, then Boston, 1890 sqq.
JE	*The Jewish Encyclopedia*, 12 vols., New York, 1901–06
JE	The combined narrative of the Jahvist (Yahwist) and Elohist
Jer	Jeremiah
Josephus, *Ant*	Flavius Josephus, "Antiquities of the Jews"
Josephus, *Apion*	Flavius Josephus, "Against Apion"
Josephus, *Life*	Life of Flavius Josephus
Josephus, *War*	Flavius Josephus, "The Jewish War"
Josh	Joshua
JPT	*Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie*, Leipsic, 1875 sqq.
JQR	*The Jewish Quarterly Review*, London, 1888 sqq.
JRAS	*Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, London, 1834 sqq.
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*, London, 1899 sqq.
Julian, *Hymnology*	J. Julian, *A Dictionary of Hymnology*, revised edition, London, 1907
KAT	See Schrader
KB	See Schrader
KD	See Friedrich, Hauck, Rettberg
KL	*Wetzer und Welte's Kirchenlexikon*, 2d ed., by J. Hergenröther and F. Kaulen, 12 vols., Freiburg, 1882–1903
Krüger, *History*	G. Krüger, *History of Early Christian Literature in the First Three Centuries*, New York, 1897
Krumbacher, *Geschichte*	K. Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur*, 2d ed., Munich, 1897
Labbe, *Concilia*	P. Labbe, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, 31 vols., Florence and Venice, 1759–98
Lam	Lamentations
Lanigan, *Eccl. Hist*	J. Lanigan, *Ecclesiastical History of Ireland to the 13th Century*, 4 vols., Dublin, 1829
Lat	Latin, Latinized
Leg	*Leges, Legum*
Lev	Leviticus
Lichtenberger, *ESR*	F. Lichtenberger, *Encyclopédie des sciences religieuses*, 13 vols., Paris, 1877–1882
Lorenz, *DGQ*	O. Lorenz, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter*, 3d ed., Berlin, 1887
LXX	The Septuagint
I Macc	I Maccabees
II Macc	II Maccabees
Mai, *Nova collectio*	A. Mai, *Scriptorum veterum nova collectio*, 10 vols., Rome, 1825–38
Mal	Malachi
Mann, *Popes*	R. C. Mann, *Lives of the Popes in the Early Middle Ages*, London, 1902 sqq.
Mansi, *Concilia*	G. D. Mansi, *Sanctorum conciliorum collectio nova*, 31 vols., Florence and Venice, 1728
Matt	Matthew
MGH	*Monumenta Germaniæ historica*, ed. G. H. Pertz and others, Hanover and Berlin, 1826 sqq. The following abbreviations are used for the sections and subsections of this work: *Ant., Antiquitates*, "Antiquities"; *Auct. ant., Auctores antiquissimi*, "Oldest Writers"; *Chron. min., Chronica minora*, "Lesser Chronicles"; *Dip., Diplomata*, "Diplomas, Documents"; *Epist., Epistolæ*, "Letters"; *Gest. pont. Rom., Gesta pontificum Romanorum*, "Deeds of the Popes of Rome"; *Leg., Leges*, "Laws"; *Lib. de lite, Libelli de lite inter regnum et sacerdotium sæculorum xi. et xii. conscripti*, "Books concerning the Strife between the Civil and Ecclesiastical Authorities in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries"; *Nec., Necrologia Germaniæ*, "Necrology of Germany"; *Poet. Lat. ævi Car., Poetæ Latini ævi Carolini*, "Latin Poets of the Caroline Time"; *Poet. Lat. med. ævi, Poetæ Latini medii ævi*, "Latin Poets of the Middle Ages"; *Script., Scriptores*, "Writers"; *Script. rer. Germ., Scriptores rerum Germanicarum*, "Writers on German Subjects"; *Script. rer. Langob., Scriptores rerum Langobardicarum et Italicarum*, "Writers on Lombard and Italian Subjects"; *Script. rer. Merov., Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum*, "Writers on Merovingian Subjects"
Mic	Micah
Milman, *Latin Christianity*	H. H. Milman, *History of Latin Christianity, Including that of the Popes to . . . Nicholas V.*, 8 vols., London, 1860–61
Mirbt, *Quellen*	C. Mirbt, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums und des römischen Katholicismus*, Tübingen, 1901
MPG	J. P. Migne, *Patrologiæ cursus completus, series Græca*, 162 vols., Paris, 1857–66
MPL	J. P. Migne, *Patrologiæ cursus completus, series Latinæ*, 221 vols., Paris, 1844–64
MS., MSS	Manuscript, Manuscripts
Muratori, *Scriptores*	L. A. Muratori, *Rerum Italicarum scriptores*, 28 vols., 1723–51
NA	*Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, Hanover, 1876 sqq.
Nah	Nahum
n.d.	no date of publication
Neander, *Christian Church*	A. Neander, *General History of the Christian Religion and Church*, 6 vols., and index, Boston, 1872–81
Neh	Nehemiah
Niceron, *Mémoires*	R. P. Niceron, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire des hommes illustrés*, 43 vols., Paris, 1729–45
Nielsen, *Papacy*	F. K. Nielsen, *History of the Papacy in the Nineteenth Century*, 2 vols., New York, 1906
Nippold, *Papacy*	F. Nippold, *The Papacy in the Nineteenth Century*, New York, 1900
NKZ	*Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift*, Leipsic, 1890 sqq.
Nowack, *Archäologie*	W. Nowack, *Lehrbuch der hebräischen Archäologie*, 2 vols., Freiburg, 1894
n.p.	no place of publication
NPNF	*The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, 1st series, 14 vols., New York, 1887–92; 2d series, 14 vols., New York, 1890–19[illegible]
N. T.	New Testament, *Novum Testamentum, Nouveau Testament, Neues Testament*
Num	Numbers
Ob	Obadiah

O. S. B.	*Ordo sancti Benedicti*, "Order of St. Benedict"
O. T.	Old Testament
OTJC	See Smith
P.	Priestly document
Pastor, *Popes*	L. Pastor, *The History of the Popes from the Close of the Middle Ages*, 8 vols., London, 1891–1908
PEA	*Patres ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*, ed. J. A. Giles, 34 vols., London, 1838–46
PEF	Palestine Exploration Fund
I Pet.	First Epistle of Peter
II Pet.	Second Epistle of Peter
Platina, *Popes*	B. Platina, *Lives of the Popes from . . Gregory VII. to Paul II.*, 2 vols., London, n.d.
Pliny, *Hist. nat.*	Pliny, *Historia naturalis*
Potthast, *Wegweiser*	A. Potthast, *Bibliotheca historica medii ævi. Wegweiser durch die Geschichtswerke*, Berlin, 1896
Prov.	Proverbs
Ps.	Psalms
PSBA	*Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archeology*, London, 1880 sqq.
q.v., qq.v.	*quod (quæ) vide*, "which see"
Ranke, *Popes*	L. von Ranke, *History of the Popes*, 3 vols., London, 1906
RDM	*Revue des deux mondes*, Paris, 1831 sqq.
RE	See Hauck-Herzog
Reich, *Documents*	E. Reich, *Select Documents Illustrating Mediæval and Modern History*, London, 1905
REJ	*Revue des études juives*, Paris, 1880 sqq.
Rettberg, *KD*	F. W. Rettberg, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, 2 vols., Göttingen, 1846–48
Rev.	Book of Revelation
RHR	*Revue de l'histoire des religions*, Paris, 1880 sqq.
Richardson, *Encyclopaedia*	E. C. Richardson, *Alphabetical Subject Index and Index Encyclopaedia to Periodical Articles on Religion, 1890–99*, New York, 1907
Richter, *Kirchenrecht*	A. L. Richter, *Lehrbuch des katholischen und evangelischen Kirchenrechts*, 8th ed. by W. Kahl, Leipsic, 1886
Robinson, *Researches*, and *Later Researches*	E. Robinson, *Biblical Researches in Palestine*, Boston, 1841, and *Later Biblical Researches in Palestine*, 3d ed. of the whole, 3 vols., 1867
Robinson, *European History*	J. H. Robinson, *Readings in European History*, 2 vols., Boston, 1904–06
Robinson and Beard, *Modern Europe*	J. H. Robinson, and C. A. Beard, *Development of Modern Europe*, 2 vols., Boston, 1907
Rom.	Epistle to the Romans
RTP	*Revue de théologie et de philosophie*, Lausanne, 1873
R. V.	Revised Version (of the English Bible)
sæc.	*sæculum*, "century"
I Sam.	I Samuel
II Sam.	II Samuel
SBA	*Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie*, Berlin, 1882 sqq.
SBE	F. Max Müller and others, *The Sacred Books of the East*, Oxford, 1879 sqq., vol. xlviii., 1904
SBOT	*Sacred Books of the Old Testament* ("Rainbow Bible"), Leipsic, London, and Baltimore, 1894 sqq.
Schaff, *Christian Church*	P. Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, vols. i.–iv., vi., vii., New York, 1882–92, vol. v., 2 parts, by D. S. Schaff, 1907–10
Schaff, *Creeds*	P. Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom*, 3 vols., New York, 1877–84
Schrader, *COT*	E. Schrader, *Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament*, 2 vols., London, 1885–88
Schrader, *KAT*	E. Schrader, *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, 2 vols., Berlin, 1902–03
Schrader, *KB*	E. Schrader, *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*, 6 vols., Berlin, 1889–1901
Schürer, *Geschichte*	E. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, 4th ed., 3 vols., Leipsic, 1902 sqq.; Eng. transl., 5 vols., New York, 1891
Script.	*Scriptores*, "writers"
Scrivener, *Introduction*	F. H. A. Scrivener, *Introduction to New Testament Criticism*, 4th ed., London, 1894
Sent.	*Sententiæ*, "Sentences"
S. J.	*Societas Jesu*, "Society of Jesus"
SMA	*Sitzungsberichte der Münchener Akademie*, Munich, 1860 sqq.
Smith, *Kinship*	W. R. Smith, *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia*, London, 1903
Smith, *OTJC*	W. R. Smith, *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, London, 1892
Smith, *Prophets*	W. R. Smith, *Prophets of Israel . . to the Eighth Century*, London, 1895
Smith, *Rel. of Sem.*	W. R. Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, London, 1894
S. P. C. K.	Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge
S. P. G.	Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts
sqq.	and following
Strom.	*Stromata*, "Miscellanies"
s.v.	sub voce, or sub verbo
Swete, *Introduction*	H. B. Swete, *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, London, 1900
Syr.	Syriac
Thatcher and McNeal, *Source Book*	O. J. Thatcher and E. H. McNeal, *A Source Book for Mediæval History*, New York, 1905
I Thess.	First Epistle to the Thessalonians
II Thess.	Second Epistle to the Thessalonians
ThT	*Theologische Tijdschrift*, Amsterdam and Leyden, 1867 sqq.
Tillemont, *Mémoires*	L. S. le Nain de Tillemont, *Mémoires . . ecclésiastiques des six premiers siècles*, 16 vols., Paris, 1693–1712
I Tim.	First Epistle to Timothy
II Tim.	Second Epistle to Timothy
TJB	*Theologischer Jahresbericht*, Leipsic, 1882–1887, Freiburg, 1888, Brunswick, 1889–1897, Berlin, 1898 sqq.
Tob.	Tobit
TQ	*Theologische Quartalschrift*, Tübingen, 1819 sqq.
TS	J. A. Robinson, *Texts and Studies*, Cambridge, 1891 sqq.
TSBA	*Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archæology*, London, 1872 sqq.
TSK	*Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, Hamburg, 1826 sqq.
TU	*Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur*, ed. O. von Gebhardt and A. Harnack, Leipsic, 1882 sqq.
Ugolini, *Thesaurus*	B. Ugolinus, *Thesaurus antiquitatum sacrarum*, 34 vols., Venice, 1744–69
V. T.	*Vetus Testamentum, Vieux Testament*, "Old Testament"
Wattenbach, *DGQ*	W. Wattenbach, *Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen*, 5th ed., 2 vols., Berlin, 1885; 6th ed., 1893–94; 7th ed., 1904 sqq.
Wellhausen, *Heidentum*	J. Wellhausen, *Reste arabischen Heidentums*, Berlin, 1887
Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*	J. Wellhausen, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*, 6th ed., Berlin, 1905, Eng. transl., Edinburgh, 1885
ZA	*Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, Leipsic, 1886–88, Berlin, 1889 sqq.
Zahn, *Einleitung*	T. Zahn, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 3d ed., Leipsic, 1907; Eng. transl., *Introduction to the New Testament*, 3 vols., Edinburgh, 1909
Zahn, *Kanon*	T. Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, 2 vols., Leipsic, 1888–92
ZATW	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, Giessen, 1881 sqq.
ZDAL	*Zeitschrift für deutsches Alterthum und deutsche Literatur*, Berlin, 1876 sqq.
ZDMG	*Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*. Leipsic, 1847 sqq.
ZDP	*Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*, Halle, 1869 sqq.
ZDPV	*Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins*, Leipsic, 1878 sqq.
Zech.	Zechariah
Zeph.	Zephaniah
ZHT	*Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie*, published successively at Leipsic, Hamburg, and Gotha, 1832–75
ZKG	*Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, Gotha, 1876 sqq.
ZKR	*Zeitschrift für Kirchenrecht*, Berlin, Tübingen, Freiburg, 1861 sqq.
ZKT	*Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, Innsbruck, 1877 sqq.
ZKW	*Zeitschrift für kirchliche Wissenschaft und kirchliches Leben*, Leipsic, 1880–89
ZNTW	*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, Giessen, 1900 sqq.
ZPK	*Zeitschrift für Protestantismus und Kirche*, Erlangen, 1838–76
ZWT	*Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, Jena, 1858–60, Halle, 1861–67, Leipsic, 1868 sqq.

SYSTEM OF TRANSLITERATION

The following system of transliteration has been used for Hebrew:

א = ' or omitted at the beginning of a word.	ז = z	ע = ‘
	ח = ḥ	פ = p
ב = b	ט = ṭ	פ = ph or p
ב = bh or b	י = y	צ = ẓ
ג = g	כ = k	ק = ḳ
ג = gh or g	כ = kh or k	ר = r
ד = d	ל = l	שׂ = s
ד = dh or d	מ = m	שׁ = sh
ה = h	נ = n	ת = t
ו = w	ס = s	ת = th or t

The vowels are transcribed by a, e, i, o, u, without attempt to indicate quantity or quality. Arabic and other Semitic languages are transliterated according to the same system as Hebrew. Greek is written with Roman characters, the common equivalents being used.

KEY TO PRONUNCIATION

When the pronunciation is self-evident the titles are not respelled; when by mere division and accentuation it can be shown sufficiently clearly the titles have been divided into syllables, and the accented syllables indicated.

a as in sof*a*	ɵ as in n*o*t	iu as in d*u*ration
ā " " *a*rm	ō " " n*o*r	c = k " " *c*at
a " " *a*t	u " " f*u*ll[2]	ch " " *ch*urch
ā " " f*a*re	ū " " r*u*le	cw = qu as in *qu*een
e " " p*e*n[1]	ʊ " " b*u*t	dh (*th*) " " *th*e
ê " " f*a*te	ʊ̄ " " b*u*rn	f " " *f*ancy
i " " t*i*n	ai " " p*i*ne	g (hard) " " *g*o
î " " mach*i*ne	au " " *ou*t	ʜ " " lo*ch* (Scotch)
o " " *o*bey	oi " " *oi*l	hw (*wh*) " " *wh*y
ō " " n*o*	iū " " f*ew*	j " " *j*aw

[1] In accented syllables only; in unaccented syllables it approximates the sound of e in over. The letter n̥ with a dot beneath it, indicates the sound of n as in ink. Nasal n (as in French words) is rendered n.

[2] In German and French names ü approximates the sound of u in d*u*ne.

PETRI, LARS, and **OLAV (OLAUS).** See SWEDEN.

PETRI, LUDWIG ADOLF: German Lutheran; b. at Lüethorst (a village of Hanover) Nov. 16, 1803; d. at Hanover Jan. 8, 1873. He was educated at the University of Göttingen (1824–27) and, after being a private tutor for some time, became, in 1829, "collaborator" at the Kreuzkirche in Hanover, where he was assistant pastor from 1837 until 1851, and senior pastor from 1851 until his death. During the years 1830–37 his convictions gradually changed from rationalistic to orthodox. His power as a preacher was especially shown by his *Licht des Lebens* (Hanover, 1858) and *Salz der Erde* (1864). For the improvement of the liturgy of his communion he wrote *Bedürfnisse und Wünsche der protestantischen Kirche im Vaterland* (Hanover, 1832); and still more important service was rendered by his edition of the *Agende der hannoverschen Kirchenordnungen* (1852). In behalf of religious instruction he wrote his *Lehrbuch der Religion für die oberen Klassen protestantischer Schulen* (Hanover, 1839; 9th ed., 1888), and later collaborated on the ill-fated new catechism of 1862. He likewise conducted for many years the theological courses in the seminary for preachers at Hanover, and in 1837 founded in the same city an association for theological candidates, over which he presided until 1848. In 1845–47 he edited, together with Eduard Niemann, the periodical *Segen der evangelischen Kirche,* and in 1848–55 was editor of the *Zeitblatt für die Angelegenheiten der lutherischen Kirche.* In 1842 he founded an annual conference of the Hanoverian Lutheran clergy; and in 1853, together with General Superintendent Steinmetz and August Friedrich Otto Münchmeyer (q.v.), he established the well-known "Lutheran Poor-box" (see GOTTESKASTEN, LUTHERISCHER).

At the same time, Petri was firmly opposed to any amalgamation of the Lutheran and Reformed Churches, and was thus led to assume an unfavorable position even toward the Inner Mission (q.v.).

In 1834 he helped to found the Hanoverian missionary society, of which he was first secretary and then president, while he materially aided the cause of foreign missions by his *Die Mission und die Kirche* (Hanover, 1841). His opposition to all movements in favor of a union of Lutherans and Reformed found renewed expression in his *Beleuchtung der Göttinger Denkschrift zur Wahrung der evangelischen Lehrfreiheit* (Hanover, 1854), an attack on the unionistic sympathies of the theological faculty of Göttingen. After this, Petri withdrew more and more from public life; and the only noteworthy work which he subsequently wrote was *Der Glaube in kurzen Betrachtungen* (4th ed., Hanover, 1875).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: E. Petri, *L. A. Petri, ein Lebensbild,* 2 vols., Hanover, 1888–96; J. Freytag, *Zu Petris Gedächtnis,* ib. 1873.

PETRIE, WILLIAM MATTHEW FLINDERS: English Egyptologist; b. in London June 3, 1853. He was educated privately, and in 1875–80 was engaged in surveying early British remains. Since 1880 he has carried on excavations of the utmost importance in Egypt, while since 1892 he has been professor of Egyptology in University College, London, and also in London University since 1907. In 1894 he founded the Egyptian Research Account (q.v.), which became the British School of Archeology in Egypt in 1905, of which he is honorary director; he is likewise on the committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund and the Royal Anthropological Institute. Among his works special mention may be made of the following: *Stonehenge* (London, 1880); *Pyramids and Temples of Gizeh* (1883); *Tanis* (2 parts, 1885–87); *Naukratis* (1886); *A Season in Egypt* (1888); *Racial Portraits* (1888); *Historical Scarabs* (1889); *Hawara, Biahmu, and Arsinoe* (1889); *Kahun, Gurob, and Hawara* (1890); *Illahun, Kahun, and Gurob* (1891); *Tell el Hesy* (1891); *Medum* (1892); *Ten Years' Digging in Egypt* (1893); *Student's History of Egypt* (3 parts, 1894–1905); *Tell el Amarna* (1895); *Egyptian Tales* (1895); *Decorative Art in Egypt* (1895); *Naqada and Ballas* (1896); *Koptos* (1896); *Six Temples at Thebes* (1897); *Deshasheh* (1897); *Religion and Conscience in Egypt* (1898); *Syria and Egypt* (2 vols., 1898); *Dendereh* (1900); *Royal Tombs of the First Dynasty* (1900); *Diospolis Parva* (1901); *Royal Tombs of the Earliest Dynasties* (1901); *Abydos* (2 parts, 1902–03); *Ehnasya* (1904); *Methods and Aims in Archeology* (1904); *Researches in Sinai* (1906); *Hyksos and Israelite Cities* (1906); *Religion of Ancient Egypt* (1906); *Janus in Modern Life* (1907); *The Arts and Crafts of Ancient Egypt* (1909); and *Personal Religion in Egypt before Christianity* (1910).

PETRIKAU, pe''tri-kau', SYNODS OF: Four Polish synods held at Petrikau (75 m. s.w. of Warsaw), Russian Poland, in 1551, 1555, 1562, and 1565. The Reformation early found welcome in Poland, especially in Posen and Cracow; and the first Protestant teachers were exclusively Lutheran. Calvinism was introduced during the reign of Sigismund August II. (1548–72), who stood in close relations to Calvin, and at the same time the Bohemian Brethren expelled from their own country took refuge in large numbers in Great Poland, especially in Posen. At the Synod of Kozminek in 1555 they united with the Calvinists, though the Roman Catholics, under the leadership of Stanislaus Hosius, bishop of Culm and Ermeland, did all in their power to obstruct the extension of the Protestant movement.

At the first Synod of Petrikau in 1551, a Roman Catholic confession of faith was drawn up, expressly intended to answer the principles of the Augsburg Confession, and severe measures were taken against converts to the new teachings. The king and the nobility, however, strongly favored the Protestant party, and the former added his voice to the demand made by the second Synod of Petrikau (1555) that a national council be convened to settle the religious controversies. Sigismund also sent representatives to the pope, requiring the administration of the chalice, the celebration of mass in the vernacular, the abolition of clerical celibacy, and the abandonment of annates. The pope, however, refused to accede to these demands, and sent a nuncio, Bishop Lipomani of Verona, to Poland to repress the Protestant movement. He entirely failed, but the success of the Polish reformers was rendered impossible by their own divisions, as became clear at the third synod, held at Petrikau in 1562. There were constant difficulties between the Lutheran and Reformed parties, and the situation was made still more complicated by the appearance of a Polish antitrinitarian movement. All attempts to secure harmony failed, and the antitrinitarians were formally excluded from fellowship with Protestants at the fourth synod of Petrikau, held in 1565, though neither this nor a royal command banishing all Italian antitrinitarians (1654) was carried out.

In the same year, at a diet convened at Petrikau, the antitrinitarian leaders secured the holding of a disputation with their opponents, though the Lutherans held aloof, and only the Reformed and the Bohemian Brethren accepted. At this disputation Gregor Pauli, a Cracow preacher and the leader of the antitrinitarians, alleged the impossibility of reconciling the Catholic creeds concerning the Persons of the Trinity with the teaching of the Scriptures; while the trinitarians insisted on the historic agreement between the Scriptures and the teaching of the whole Church. After fourteen days of debate the two parties were farther apart than ever. The antitrinitarian representatives, moreover, disagreed among themselves, some denying the preexistence of Christ and the personality of the Holy Spirit, others accepting the preexistence of Christ and the reality of the Holy Spirit, and yet others assuming three Persons in the Trinity, but ascribing different values to them. The final outcome of the matter was the exclusion of the antitrinitarians from the Reformed Church, so that henceforth they constituted a separate communion.

(DAVID ERDMANN†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Besides the literature under POLAND, CHRISTIANITY IN, and the works of Dalton and Kruske named under LASCO, JOHANNES A, consult: A. Regenvolscius (A. Wengierski), *Systema historico-chronologicum ecclesiarum Slavonicarum*, pp. 180 sqq., Utrecht, 1652; S. Lubenski, *Historia reformationis Polonicæ*, pp. 144 sqq., 201 sqq., Freistadt, 1685; E. Borgius, *Aus Posens und Polens kirchlicher Vergangenheit*, pp. 14 sqq., Berlin, 1898; and G. Krause, *Die Reformation und Gegenreformation in Polen*, Posen, 1901.

PETROBRUSSIANS. See PETER OF BRUYS.

PETRUS MONGUS. See MONOPHYSITES, §§ 5 sqq.

PEUCER, pei'tser, CASPAR: Leader of the crypto-Calvinists (see PHILIPPISTS) in the electorate of Saxony; b. at Bautzen (31 m. e.n.e. of Dresden) Jan. 6, 1525; d. at Dessau (67 m. s.w. of Berlin) Sept. 2, 1602. He was educated at the University of Wittenberg, which he entered in 1540, and where he became professor of mathematics in 1554 and of medicine in 1560. Throughout the life of Melanchthon, whose son-in-law he was, he was his friend, counselor, physician, and companion, while after the Reformer's death he edited his collected works (Wittenberg, 1562–64), two books of his *Epistolæ* (1570), the third and fourth volumes of his *Selectæ declamationes* (Strasburg, 1557–58), etc. He likewise completed Melanchthon's revision of the *Chronicon Carionis*, which had extended only to Charlemagne, by two books bringing it down to the Leipsic disputation (2 parts, Wittenberg, 1562–65); while among his independent writings mention may be made of his *De dimensione terræ* (Wittenberg, 1550) and *De præcipuis divinationum generibus* (1553).

Peucer was a favorite at the Dresden court, where he was appointed physician in 1570, though still retaining his Wittenberg professorship. At his instance Melanchthon's *Corpus doctrinæ* was officially introduced in 1564, thus marking the rise of Philippism; and vacancies in the university were filled with strict followers of Melanchthon. In 1571 he collaborated in a school abridgment of the *Corpus doctrinæ* which sharply denied Luther's teaching of Ubiquity (q.v.), and with the death of Paul Eber (q.v.) in 1569 approximation to Calvinism became still easier. At the same time, the strict Lutheran party continued to have much influence at court because their side was taken by the elector's wife, a Danish princess. Considerations of foreign policy, however, finally induced the elector to dismiss his favorite physician, especially as he was accused, though wrongly, of having a part in a Calvinistic exposition of the faith, *Exegesis perspicua*, published by Joachim Cureus in 1574. Peucer's correspondence was searched, and evidence was found which was construed as expressing his intention to try to introduce the Calvinistic theory of the Lord's Supper into the Saxon Church. He acknowledged his fault when tried before the Saxon diet at Torgau, and was directed to restrict his interest to medicine. But the Elector August was

not contented and had Peucer, whom he suspected of working to introduce the rival ducal house into Saxony, taken to Rochlitz. In 1576 Peucer was imprisoned in the Pleissenburg in Leipsic, where he suffered much hardship, but determinedly resisted all attempts to convert him, refusing to make any concessions contrary to Calvinism. Finally, when the Danish princess died, and the elector married a second time (Jan. 3, 1586), his father-in-law, Prince Joachim Ernest of Anhalt successfully pleaded for Peucer's release. This took place on Feb. 8, 1586, a few days before the death of August.

Peucer now went to Dessau, where he was appointed physician in ordinary and councilor to the prince. The remaining years of his life were peaceful, spent partly in Dessau, partly in Cassel and the Palatinate, and partly in travels, and he was honored by all. To the last he adhered to Melanchthon's theology, and he was likewise busy with his pen. During his imprisonment he began his *Historia carcerum et liberationis divinæ* (ed. after the author's death by Christoph Pezel, Zurich, 1605); and he also wrote in prison his *Tractatus historicus de Philippi Melanchthonis sententia de controversia coenæ Domini* (Amberg, 1596), as well as a poetical *Idyllium, patria seu historia Lusatiæ superioris* (Bautzen, 1594). (G. KAWERAU.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: For Peucer's letters consult *CR*, vols. vii. and ix.; J. Voigt, *Briefwechsel der berühmtesten Gelehrten*, pp. 497 sqq., Königsberg, 1841; and *Zeitschrift für preussische Geschichte*, xiv (1877), 90 sqq., 145 sqq. Early sources are the funeral sermon by J. Brendel, Zerbst, 1603; a memorial oration by S. Stenius, ib. 1603; and A. van de Corput, *Het Leven ende Dood van P. Melanchton . . Mitsgaders de . . gevangenisse van Caspar Peucerus*, Amsterdam, 1662. Biographies or sketches are by: J. C. Leupold, Budissin, 1745; H. C. A. Eichstädt, Jena, 1841; E. A. H. Heimburg, Jena, 1842; F. Coch, Marburg, 1850; E. L. T. Henke, Marburg, 1865. Consult further: R. Calinich, *Kampf und Untergang des Melanchthonismus in Kursachsen*, Leipsic, 1866; J. W. Richard, *Philip Melanchton*, New York, 1898; J. Janssen, *Hist. of the German People*, vols. vii.–viii., St. Louis, 1905; N. Müller, *Melanchthons letzte Lebenstage*, 1910; Ersch and Gruber, *Encyklopädie*, III., xix. 435–460; *ADB*, xxv. 552 sqq.; and the literature under PHILIPPISTS.

PEW: Ecclesiastically, an enclosed seat in a church (not, in the modern sense, an open bench). The term (Old Fr. *pui, puy, puye, poi, peu*, "an elevated place," "seat"; Lat. *podium*, "balcony") in early English use meant a more or less elevated enclosure for business in a public place; this use was probably prior to its employment as the name for an enclosed seat for worshipers in a church. Indeed, the pew might be even a box in a theater. The pew is not, then, an original or primitive part of the church edifice, the floor of the structure being in early times open and unobstructed, though in the chancel there came to be seats for the clergy and choir. This tradition is continued in modern times in Roman and Greek cathedrals in Europe, which are usually without pews, portable benches or chairs being furnished instead. In early times the attitude of worshipers was standing (or kneeling), and the provision of stools or benches probably does not date back of the fourteenth century, though some English churches had stone benches along the walls and around pillars.

The earliest known examples of regular benching is probably that of the church at Soest (34 m. s.e. of Münster, Westphalia) in the early fifteenth century. The church at Swaffham (25 m. w. of Norwich), England, was in 1454 provided with pews by private benefaction, and this was almost certainly not the first instance in England. The records of St. Michael's, Cornhill, London, prove the existence of pews in that church in 1457, the doors of some of which, at least, had locks, a fact which implies private ownership. It seems certain, however, that at first only parts of the edifice were provided with pews. The shape of these does not seem to have been uniform. While the oblong pew was naturally the most common, the seat facing the altar, other pews were square with the seats placed around three or all four sides, leaving space only for the door. These latter were often private, appropriated to the use of the lord of the manor or to a family an early member of which had in some way acquired a perpetual interest. In England the right to occupy a certain pew sometimes goes with the occupancy of a certain house in the parish. The acquisition of property-right in a pew is not confined to England; in quite a number of churches in the United States pews are held by families and may figure as property in valuation of assets. But the tendency is decidedly against this exclusive right, and where such cases exist, the policy of the church is usually to redeem the pew from private ownership.

It is not certain at what period pews were made a means of income to the parish. In St. Margaret's, Westminster, the records show payment of pew rents as early as the first part of the sixteenth century. The law of England gives to every parishioner a right to a sitting in the parish church if it was built before 1818, and this right is enforceable by civil procedure. In the United States custom varies greatly. Almost general is the practise of using the pews as a means of raising revenue for church purposes. In a considerable number of churches the pew rents provide the principal means of income, pews being rented by the year. In a large number of churches, however, the feeling exists that this is a limitation upon the "freedom of the Gospel," and the sittings are all free, the income being derived from collections or pledges of free-will offerings.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. M. Beale, *Hist. of Pews*, Cambridge, 1841; J. C. Fowler, *Church Pews, their Origin and Legal Incidents*, London, 1844; G. H. H. Oliphant, *The Law of Pews in Churches and Chapels*, ib. 1850; A. Heales, *Hist. and Law of Church Seats or Pews*, 2 vols., ib. 1872.

PEZEL, pê'tsel, CHRISTOPH: German crypto-Calvinist; b. at Plauen (61 m. s.w. of Leipsic) Mar. 5, 1539; d. at Bremen Feb. 25, 1604. He was educated at the universities of Jena and Wittenberg, his studies at the latter institution being interrupted by his teaching for several years. In 1557 he was appointed professor in the philosophical faculty and in 1569 was ordained preacher at the Schlosskirche in Wittenberg. In the same year he entered the theological faculty, where he soon became involved in the disputes between the followers of Melanchthon and Luther, writing the *Apologia veræ doctrinæ de definitione Evangelii* (Wittenberg, 1571)

and being the chief author of the Wittenberg catechism of 1571. He soon took a leading position as a zealous Philippist, but in 1574 he and his colleagues were summoned to Torgau and required to give up the Calvinistic theory of the Lord's Supper. As they refused to subscribe to the articles presented to them, they were placed under surveillance in their own houses and forbidden to discuss or to print anything on the questions in dispute. They were afterward deposed from their professorships, and in 1576 were banished. Pezel, who had hitherto been at Zeitz, now went to Eger; but in 1577, like his fellow exiles, received a position from Count John of Nassau, first at the school in Siegen and later at Dillingen.

Pezel then definitely accepted Calvinism, and the Church in Dillenburg was united to the Calvinistic body. In 1578 he became pastor at Herborn, and in 1580 was permitted by Count John to go for a few weeks to Bremen to try to reconcile the Church difficulties between the Calvinists and Lutherans. His task was difficult, however, since the Lutheran Jodocus Glanæus refused to meet him in open debate. The civil authorities, construing this as contumacy, deposed Glanæus, and Pezel preached in his place. He soon returned to Nassau, but in 1581 was permanently appointed the successor of Glanæus at Bremen, where, four years later, he was made superintendent of the churches and schools. At the same time he became pastor of the Liebfrauenkirche, though he also retained his pastorate at the Ansgariikirche till 1598. He took an active part in improving and extending the work at the Bremen gymnasium, where he was professor of theology, moral philosophy, and history, being also the leader in all the theological controversies in which the Bremen church became involved. Pezel did away with Luther's Catechism, substituting for it his own Bremen catechism, which remained in force until the eighteenth century, removed images and pictures from the churches, formed a ministerium which united the clergy, and, by his *Consensus ministerii Bremensis ecclesiæ* of 1595, prepared the way for the complete acceptance of Calvinistic doctrine.

Pezel was the editor of many theological writings, of which the most important were the *Loci theologici* of his teacher, Victorinus Strigel (4 parts, Neustadt, 1581–84); Philip Melanchthon's *Consilia* (1600); and Caspar Peucer's *Historia carcerum et liberationis divinæ* (Zurich, 1605); while among his independent works special mention may be made of the following: *Argumenta et objectiones de præcipuis articulis doctrinæ Christianæ* (Neustadt, 1580–89); *Libellus precationum* (1585); and *Mellificium historicum, complectens historiam trium monarchiarum, Chaldaicæ, Persicæ, Græcæ* (1592). He is particularly interesting as showing the evolution from Melanchthon's attitude toward predestination to the complete determinism of the Calvinistic concept of the dogma. (G. KAWERAU.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Autobiographic material is contained in Pezel's *Widerholte warhaffte . Erzehlung*, Bremen, 1582, in *Wittenberger Ordiniertenbuch*, ii (1895), 117. Consult: J. H. Steubing, *Nassauische Kirchen- und Reformationsgeschichte*, Hadamar, 1804; *ZHT*, 1866, pp. 382 sqq., 1873, 179 sqq.; Iken, in *Bremisches Jahrbuch*, ix (1877), 1 sqq., x (1878), 34 sqq.; E. Jacobs, *Juliana von Stolberg*, pp. 286 sqq., Wernigerode, 1889; W. von Bippen, *Geschichte der Stadt Bremen*, ii. 199, Bremen, 1898; Ersch and Gruber, *Encyklopädie*, III., xx. 63 sqq.; *ADB*, xxv. 575 sqq.

PFAFF, pfäf, **CHRISTOPH MATTHAEUS:** German Lutheran; b. at Stuttgart Dec. 24, 1686; d. at Giessen Nov. 19, 1760. He was educated at the University of Tübingen (1699–1702), and became lecturer in 1705, but in the following year, at the command of the duke of Württemberg, traveled extensively in Germany, Denmark, Holland, and England, with special attention to the study of Semitic languages. Almost immediately on his return he was directed to proceed to Italy with the heir apparent, with whom he spent three years in Turin. Here, as elsewhere, he was unwearied in searching through libraries, and was rewarded by the discovery of many fragments hitherto unknown, as of sermons of Chrysostom and portions of Hippolytus. In this way he also found the epitome of the "Institutes" of Lactantius, which he edited at Paris in 1712; and he aroused wide interest by the alleged discovery of four fragments of Ignatius which he published, with voluminous dissertations, at The Hague in 1715. Over these fragments an animated controversy was long waged. It is now generally held that they are not to be ascribed to Ignatius; though the question remains whether they were a forgery of Pfaff's, or whether they were cut out of some Turin catena manuscript. Both contingencies were possible in the case of Pfaff, who is known to have mutilated a Turin manuscript of Hippolytus, and to have forged a document to establish the claim of the house of Savoy to the titular kingdom of Cyprus.

In 1712 Pfaff returned to Germany and remained a year at Stuttgart, after which he visited Holland and France with the heir apparent, returning permanently to Germany in 1716. Despite his youth, Pfaff was then appointed professor of theology at Tübingen, where he rose steadily, becoming chancellor of the university at the age of thirty-four, and retaining this dignity for thirty-six years. He was a man of great versatility and of encyclopedic learning, and at the same time was indefatigable as an author. He wrote a large number of dissertations, of which the *De originibus juris ecclesiastici ejusdem indole* (Tübingen, 1719) marked the beginning of a new epoch in its field, for in it, and in the *Akademische Reden über das sowohl allgemeine als auch teutsche protestantische Kirchenrecht* (1742), he for the first time carried to its logical results the doctrine of Collegialism (q.v.). In the sphere of theology he wrote *Constitutiones theologiæ dogmaticæ et moralis* (Tübingen, 1719); *Introductio in historiam theologiæ literariam* (1720); *Institutiones historiæ ecclesiasticæ* (1721); and *Notæ exegeticæ in evangelium Matthæi* (1721); while his pietistic sympathies found expression in such works as his *Kurtzer Abriss vom wahren Christentum* (Tübingen, 1720) and *Hertzens-Katechismus* (1720), and his general Biblical scholarship was evinced by his collaboration with Johann Christian Klemm in the preparation of the "Tübingen Bible" of 1730 (see BIBLES, ANNOTATED, I., § 1).

Pfaff was chiefly active, however, in endeavor-

ing to unite the Protestant churches, and to this end he composed a long series of monographs which were collected in German translation under the title of *Gesammelte Schrifften, so zur Vereinigung der Protestierenden abzielen* (Halle, 1723). Here again he was no innovator, and though his proposals attracted wide attention, Lutheran opposition rendered them fruitless.

Henceforth Pfaff frittered away his energies, producing work more remarkable for quantity than quality, and plunging into countless trivial literary controversies. He lost his popularity and influence in the university, forfeited the interest of the students, and in 1756 resigned from the chancellorship. His departure from Tübingen was unmourned, but his intention of spending the remainder of his life in retirement at Frankfort was frustrated by a call to Giessen, where he became chancellor, superintendent, and director of the theological faculty. Here he remained until his death, four years later, though here, too, the faults which dimmed his great talents gained him general enmity.

(Erwin Preuschen.)

Bibliography: The short *Vita* in *Gesammelte Schrifften*, ut sup., ii. 1–9, was used by C. P. Leporin for his *Verbesserte Nachricht von C. M. Pfaffens Leben*, Leipsic, 1726, and this in turn was the basis of the account in Zedler's *Universallexicon*, xxvii. 1198, ib. 1741 and other narratives in biographical works. Consult F. W. Strieder, *Hessiche Gelehrtengeschichte*, x. 322 sqq., 21 vols., Göttingen, 1781–1868; A. F. Büsching, *Beyträge zu der Lebensgeschichte denkwürdiger Personen*, iii. 170–171, 287–288, 6 parts, Halle, 1783–89; J. M. H. Döring, *Gelehrte Theologen im 18. Jahrhundert*, iii. 249 sqq., 4 vols., Neustadt, 1831–1835; W. Gass, *Geschichte der protestantischen Dogmatik*, iii. 74 sqq., 4 vols., Berlin, 1854–57; C. Weizsäcker, *Lehrer und Unterricht von dem evangelischen Fakultät*, pp. 97 sqq., in *Tübinger Festschrift*, 1877; A. Ritschl, *Geschichte des Pietismus*, iii. 42 sqq., Bonn, 1886; Ersch and Gruber, *Encyklopädie*, III., xx. 101 sqq.; *ADB*, xxv. 587 sqq.

PFAFFENBRIEF, pfāf″en-brîf′: A compact, dated Oct. 7, 1370, whereby the cantons of Zurich, Lucerne, Zug, Uri, Schwyz, and Unterwalden united to oppose foreign spiritual and secular jurisdiction and to preserve national peace. The immediate cause of the compact was the attack upon and imprisonment of Peter of Gundoldingen, head of Zurich's ally, Lucerne, and his party by Bruno Brun, provost of the cathedral of Zurich (Sept. 13, 1370). The aggressor, an adherent of the Austrian party, refused to recognize the jurisdiction of a secular court, and was accordingly banished, while his prisoner was released. Such, however, was the fear that Brun might appeal to foreign, imperial, or ecclesiastical courts that, to avoid any such contingency in future, the Pfaffenbrief was drawn up. This document merely emphasized and guaranteed existing rights. It laid down two principles: all cases within the confederation, except matrimonial and ecclesiastical, must be tried before the local judge, who had jurisdiction even over aliens (thus ignoring both the imperial courts and foreign spiritual courts); it contained resolutions relating to the public peace, and forbade waging wars without the consent of the government. At the same time, ecclesiastical jurisdiction was not annulled, and cases in which one of the clergy was defendant were usually tried in the episcopal courts. By requiring the oath of allegiance from the clergy, moreover, the Pfaffenbrief indirectly tended to subordinate the clergy to the State in matters applying equally to clergy and laity. By thus delimiting, in an important sphere of law, what appertained to the State and what to the Church, and by favoring the claims of the former rather than of the latter, the Pfaffenbrief marked the first real and successful Swiss attempt to restrict by means of the secular law the unlimited extension of ecclesiastical power.

(F Fleiner.)

Bibliography: A. P. von Segesser, *Rechtsgeschichte der Stadt . Luzern*, vols. i.–ii., passim, Lucerne, 1850–58; J. C. Bluntschli, *Staats- und Rechtsgeschichte . Zurich*, i. 385 sqq., Zurich, 1838; idem, *Geschichte des schweizerischen Bundesrechts*, i. 122 sqq., Stuttgart, 1875; T. von Leibenau, in *Anzeiger für schweizerische Geschichte*, 1882, p. 60; W. Oechsli, in *Politisches Jahrbuch der schweiz. Eidgenossenschaft*, v (1890), 359–365; idem, *Quellenbuch der Schweizergeschichte*, Zurich, 1901; J. Dierauer, *Geschichte der schweiz. Eidgenossenschaft*, i. 282 sqq., Gotha, 1887; K. Dändliker, *Geschichte der Schweiz*, i. 545 sqq., 632 sqq., Zurich, 1900; J. Hürbin, *Handbuch der Schweizergeschichte*, i. 197, Stans, 1900; *Die Bundesbriefe der alten Eidgenossen, 1291-1513*, Zurich, 1904.

PFANDER, pfān′der, **KARL GOTTLIEB:** Missionary to the Mohammedans; b. at Waiblingen (7 m. n.e. of Stuttgart), Germany, Nov. 3, 1803; d. at Richmond (8 m. w.s.w. of London) Dec. 1, 1865. His father was a baker, who, perceiving his aptitude for study and sharing his ambitions, sent him first to the Latin school in the town, then to Kornthal (q.v.), and finally to the missionary institute at Basel, where he studied from 1820 to 1825. He was a remarkable linguist and of indefatigable energy, and spent his life in the effort to convert Mohammedans. From 1825 to 1829 he labored in Shusha, in Transcaucasia, and neighboring lands; from 1829 to 1831 he was with Anthony Norris Groves (q.v.) in Bagdad; from Mar. to Sept., 1831, in Persia, but then returned to Shusha. In 1835 the Russian government forbade all missionary operations except those of the Greek Church; consequently he had to leave Shusha. He went first to Constantinople, in 1836 was back in Shusha, but in 1837 started for India by way of Persia and arrived in Calcutta Oct. 1, 1838. As it seemed most promising to work henceforth under English auspices he, with the full consent of the Basel Society, became a missionary of the Church Missionary Society, Feb. 12, 1840. He was in Agra from 1841 to 1855, in Peshawar from 1855 to 1857, and in Constantinople from 1858 to 1865. His death occurred while on his furlough.

He married first Sophia Reuss, a German, in Moscow, July 11, 1834, who died in childbed in Shusha, May 12, 1835; second, Emily Swinburne, an Englishwoman, in Calcutta, Jan. 19, 1841, who bore him three boys and three girls, and survived him fifteen years. He wrote few books, and most of them in oriental languages. One that is in English was his *Remarks on the Nature of Muhammedanism*, Calcutta, 1840. But one of his books is a missionary classic. He drafted it in German in May, 1829, while in Shusha, then he expanded and perfected it. It bears in German the title *Mizan ul Hakk oder die Wage der Wahrheit*, translations have been made of it into Armenian, Turkish, Persian, and Ordu, and it has been widely circulated among

Mohammedans of many lands. There is an English translation of it under the title, *The Mizan ul Haqq; or Balance* [should be *Balances*] *of Truth* (London, 1867, new ed., 1910). It is a cogent and incisive attack on Mohammedanism and an explanation and application of Christianity, written in simple language but with deep conviction and ample knowledge. In recognition of the service he had thus rendered, the archbishop of Canterbury (John Bird Sumner) made him a doctor of divinity in 1857.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: C. F. Eppler, *D. Karl Gottlieb Pfander*, Basel, 1888; Emily Headland, *Sketches of Church Missionary Society Workers*, London, 1897.

PFEFFINGER, pfef'ing-er, **JOHANN:** Saxon Reformer; b. at Wasserburg (31 m. e.s.e. of Munich), Upper Bavaria, Dec. 27, 1493; d. at Leipsic Jan. 1, 1573. Devoting himself to the religious life, he became an acolyte at Salzburg in 1515, and soon afterward was made subdeacon and deacon. Receiving a dispensation from the regulations concerning canonical age, he was ordained priest and stationed at Reichenhall, Saalfelden, and Passau, where his clerical activity soon found great approbation. Suspected of Lutheran heresy, he went to Wittenberg in 1523, where he was cordially welcomed by Luther, Melanchthon, and Bugenhagen. In 1527 he went as parish priest to Sonnenwalde; and in 1530, when expelled by the bishop of Meissen, he removed to the monastery of Eicha, near Leipsic, where his services were attended by many outside the parish. In 1532 he went to Belgern, whence he was delegated, in 1539, to complete the Reformation in Leipsic. In 1540, he was permanently vested with the office of superintendent.

He declined calls to Halle and Breslau, though he took part in completing the work of the Reformation at Glauchau in 1542. In his capacity of censor he prevented further printing of Schenk's postilla. In 1543 he was graduated as the first Protestant doctor of theology, and became a professor of theology in the following year. In 1548 he was made a canon of Meissen.

Duke Maurice of Saxony drew him into the negotiations regarding the introduction of a Protestant church constitution and liturgy. Having been appointed assessor in the Leipsic consistory in 1543, he participated, in 1545, in the consecration of a bishop of Merseburg as one of the ordaining clergy. In the following year he negotiated at Dresden with Anton Musa and Daniel Greser, and took part in the deliberations concerning the Interim at the Diet of Meissen (July, 1548), at Torgau (Oct. 18), at Altzella (Nov.), and at the Leipsic Saxon Diet (Dec. 22). The Elector August likewise sought formal expressions of opinion from Pfeffinger; and in this connection, in 1555, he proposed, with a view to securing religious uniformity, that the Interim liturgy of 1549 should again be used. Melanchthon, however, opposed this suggestion, holding that, were it adopted, additional religious disunion would follow. Pfeffinger also took part in the deliberative proceedings of the delegates of the three consistories in 1556, as well as in the Dresden convention of 1571.

Pfeffinger's writings were ethical, ascetic, and polemic. His *Propositiones de libero arbitrio* (1555) occasioned the outbreak of the synergistic strife (see SYNERGISM). Against Nikolaus von Amsdorf he wrote his *Antwort* (Wittenberg, 1558), *Demonstratio mendacii* (1558), and *Nochmals gründlicher Bericht;* while he opposed Matthias Flacius in his *Verantwortung.* He embodied his tenets in five articles of the *Formula der Bekendnus* of June 3, 1556, which he also submitted, in amplified form, to the Wittenberg theologians. GEORG MÜLLER.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: B. Sartorius, *Einfeltiger . . Bericht von dem Leben J. Pfeffingers*, Leipsic, 1573; F. Seifert, in heft iv. of *Beiträge zur sächsischen Kirchengeschichte*, Leipsic, 1888; G. Müller, in heft ix. of the same, pp. 98, 118, 165, 181, and x. 210; *ADB*, xxv. 624–630.

PFEILSCHIFTER, pfail'shift-er, **GEORG:** German Roman Catholic; b. at Mering (7 m. s.e. of Augsburg), Upper Bavaria, May 13, 1870. He was educated at the universities of Munich (1889–93, 1894–99; D.D., 1897) and Vienna (1899), interrupting his studies to make a five months' tour of Italy in 1897. In 1900 he became privat-docent for church history at the University of Munich, but in the same year accepted a call to the Lyceum of Freising as associate professor of church history and patristics. Since 1903 he has been professor of church history in the University of Freiburg. He has written *Der Ostgotenkönig Theoderich der Grosse und die katholische Kirche* (Münster, 1896); *Die authentische Ausgabe der vierzig Evangelienhomilien Gregors des Grossen, ein erster Beitrag zur Geschichte der Ueberlieferung* (Munich, 1900); and *Zur Entstehung der Allegorie vom mystischen Gotteswagen bei Dante Purgatorio* (Freiburg, 1904).

PFENDER, pfen'der or [F.] fan''dār', **CHARLES LEBERECHT:** French Lutheran; b. at Hatten in Alsace Oct. 26, 1834. He pursued his studies at Wittenberg, the College de Pont-a-Mousson (B.Litt., 1853), under the faculty of theology at Strasburg (B.Th., 1859), and at the universities of Heidelberg, Göttingen, and Berlin; he became vicar at Wittenberg in 1860; at Paris, 1865; pastor of the Église du Batignolles, Paris, 1868, and of the Église Saint-Paul, same city, in 1874. He describes himself as theologically a confessional Lutheran. He is the author of *La Confession d'Augsbourg. Traduction revue d'après le texte le plus autorisé. Précédée d'une introduction* (Paris, 1872); *L'Agneau de Dieu. Récit de la passion et de la résurrection du Seigneur d'après les quatre évangélistes. Suivi de méditations, de prières, et de cantiques pour la semaine sainte* (1873); *Vie de Martin Luther, publiée a l'occasion du quatrième centenaire de sa naissance* (1883). He is a contributor to the present work, and has written much for other standard publications.

PFLEIDERER, pflai'der-er, **OTTO:** German Protestant; b. at Stetten (a village near Cannstadt, 4 m. n.e. of Stuttgart), Württemberg, Sept. 1, 1839; d. at Grosslichterfelde, Berlin, July 19, 1908. He was educated at the University of Tübingen from 1857 to 1861, and after being for a short time vicar at Eningen, a village near Reutlingen, traveled extensively in North Germany, England, and Scotland until 1864. He was then lecturer and privat-

docent at Tübingen until 1868, after which he was a pastor at Heilbronn till 1870, when he went to Jena as chief pastor and university preacher. In 1870 he was appointed professor of theology at the University of Jena, and from 1875 till his death he was professor of practical theology at the University of Berlin. He was one of the most learned and vigorous defenders of the non-miraculous origin of Christianity. He lectured in England on both the Hibbert (1885) and the Gifford (1892–93) foundations. He wrote *Die Religion, ihr Wesen und ihre Geschichte* (2 vols., Leipsic, 1869); *Moral und Religion* (Haarlem, 1870); *Der Paulinismus* (Leipsic, 1873; Eng. transl. by E. Peters, *Paulinism*, 2 vols., London, 1877); *F. G. Fichte, Lebensbild eines deutschen Denkers und Patrioten* (Stuttgart, 1877); *Religionsphilosophie auf geschichtlicher Grundlage* (Berlin, 1878; 2d ed., 2 vols., 1883–84; Eng. transl. by A. Stewart and A. Menzies, *Philosophy of Religion*, 4 vols., London, 1886–88); *Zur religiösen Verständigung* (1879); *Grundriss der christlichen Glaubens und Sittenlehre* (1880); *The Influence of the Apostle Paul on the Development of Christianity* (Hibbert lectures; London, 1885); *Das Urchristentum, seine Schriften und Lehren* (Berlin, 1885; 2d ed., 1902; Eng. transl., *Primitive Christianity. Its Writings and Teachings*, 2 vols., New York, 1906–09); *The Development of Theology in Germany since Kant, and its Progress in Great Britain since 1825* (London, 1890; German ed., *Der Entwickelung der protestantischen Theologie in Deutschland seit Kant und in Grossbritannien seit 1825*, Freiburg, 1891); *Die Ritschlsche Theologie kritisch beleuchtet* (Brunswick, 1891); *The Philosophy and Development of Religion* (Gifford lectures; 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1894); *Evolution and Theology, and other Essays* (New York, 1900); *Das Christusbild des urchristlichen Glaubens* (Berlin, 1903; Eng. transl., *The Early Christian Conception of Christ: Its Value and Significance in the History of Religion*, London, 1905); *Die Entstehung des Christentums* (Munich, 1905; Eng. transl., *Christian Origins*, London, 1906); *Religion und Religionen* (1906; Eng. transl., *Religion and Historic Faiths*, London, 1907); and *Die Entwicklung des Christentums* (1907; Eng. transl., *The Development of Christianity*, London, 1910).

PFLUG, pflūg, **JULIUS:** Roman Catholic bishop of Naumburg; b. at Eytra (a village near Zwenkau, 9 m. s.s.w. of Leipsic) 1499; d. at Zeitz (23 m. s.w. of Leipsic) Sept. 3, 1564. He studied at the universities of Leipsic (1510–17) and Bologna (1517–19), and returned to Germany in 1519 to become canon in Meissen. Disturbed by the religious controversies at home, he returned to Bologna, whence he went to Padua, but in 1521, induced by offers of preferment from Duke George, he returned to his native state, first of all to Dresden, and then to Leipsic, where he still continued to devote himself chiefly to humanistic interests. In 1528–29 he was again in Italy, and in 1530 he accompanied Duke George to the Diet of Augsburg. At this time he became a correspondent of Erasmus, and in his letters to him unfolded his plan for restoring religious peace to Germany. Everything could be done, he thought, by the influence of moderate men like Erasmus and Melanchthon. Erasmus replied that things had gone so far that even a council could be of no help; one party wanted revolution, the other would tolerate no reform. In 1532 Pflug became dean of Zeitz, where he had to grapple with the practical question of the Reformation, since not only was the bishop, who was also diocesan of Freising, continually absent, but the neighboring Protestant elector of Saxony was alleging claims of jurisdiction over the see. Pflug was in favor of lay communion under both kinds, the marriage of the priesthood, and general moral reform. He took part in the Leipsic colloquy in 1534, and as dean of Meissen prepared for the clergy of the diocese the constitutions reprinted in the *Leges seu constitutiones ecclesiæ Budissinensis* (1573). As one of the envoys of John of Meissen, Pflug endeavored, in 1539, to secure from the papal nuncio, Alexander, who was then at Vienna, adhesion to his project for a reform of Roman Catholicism along the lines already indicated, only to be obliged to wait for the decision of the pope.

The Reformation was now carried through in Meissen, and Pflug took refuge in Zeitz, later retiring to his canonry at Maintz, and thus rendering Zeitz more accessible to the Protestant movement. In 1541 he was appointed bishop of Naumburg, but John Frederick, the elector of Saxony, hating all men of moderation, forbade him to occupy his see. Pflug was uncertain whether he would accept the nomination or not; and meanwhile the elector, after vainly urging the chapter to nominate another bishop, turned the cathedral of Naumburg over to Protestant services and proposed to provide for the election of a bishop according to his liking. The elector's theologians, though exceedingly dubious regarding his course, finally yielded, and John Frederick selected Nikolaus von Amsdorf (q.v.) for the place and had him ordained by Luther. On Jan. 15, 1542, however, Pflug accepted his election to the bishopric, and sought to have his rights protected by the diets of Speyer (1542, 1544), Nuremberg (1543), and Worms (1545). At the latter diet the emperor directed the elector to admit Pflug to his bishopric, and to repudiate Amsdorf and the secular directors of the chapter. John Frederick refused, however, and the question was settled only by the Schmalkald War.

Hitherto Pflug had been in favor of a Roman Catholic reform of a far-reaching character, as was shown by his part at the Regensburg Conference of 1541 (see REGENSBURG, CONFERENCE OF); but political conditions and his troubles with the elector of Saxony now made him a bitter opponent of the Reformation. In 1547, when the Schmalkald War closed, Pflug took possession of his bishopric under imperial protection. He was a prominent factor in the negotiations which resulted in the Interim (q.v.), the basis of which was formed by the revision of his *Formula sacrorum emendandorum* (ed. C. G. Müller, Leipsic, 1803) by himself, Michael Helding, Johannes Agricola, Domingo de Soto, and Pedro de Malvenda. Pflug now entertained still higher hopes of realizing his reform of Roman Catholicism. He took part in negotiations in Pe-

gau, continuing them in a secret correspondence with Melanchthon to induce him and Prince George of Anhalt to accept a modified sacrificial theory of the mass; and he was also concerned in the deliberations between Maurice and Joachim II. and their theologians at Jüterboch. The result was the first draft of the Leipsic Interim, which was submitted to the national diet in his presence.

In his own diocese Pflug refrained from disturbing the Lutherans, restoring Roman Catholic worship only in the chief church in Zeitz and the cathedral of Naumburg, and even permitting Protestant services to be held in the latter. There was almost an entire dearth of Roman Catholic clergy, nor could he secure a sufficient number from other dioceses. He was accordingly forced to allow the married ministers whom Amsdorf had placed in office to retain their positions, though without Roman Catholic ordination. In Nov., 1551, he was present for a short time at the Council of Trent. Even after the final success of the Protestants in 1552, he remained in undisturbed possession of his see, thanks to his popularity and moderation; and after the abdication of Charles V., he urged the best interests of Germany in his *Oratio de ordinanda republica Germaniæ* (Cologne, 1562). In 1557 he presided at the religious conference at Worms, but was unable to prevent the Flacians from wrecking negotiations. To the last, however, he hoped that, when the Council of Trent reassembled, his moderate program would be successful in restoring religious peace. (G. KAWERAU.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The earlier biographies are superseded by that of A. Jansen, in *Neue Mittheilungen aus dem Gebiet histor.-antiq. Forschungen*, x (1863), parts 1 and 2. Consult further: A. von Druffel, *Briefe und Akten zur Geschichte des 16. Jahrhunderts*, Munich, 1873 sqq.; L. Pastor, *Die kirchlichen Reunionsbestrebungen*, Freiburg, 1879; Sixtus Braun, *Naumburger Annalen*, pp. 280 sqq., Naumburg, 1892; Rosenfeld, in *ZKG*, xix (1898), 155 sqq.; E. Hoffmann, *Naumburg im Zeitalter der Reformation*, Leipsic, 1901; J. Janssen, *Hist. of the German People*, vi. 147, 182–187, 248, 366, 396 sqq., St. Louis, 1903. Scattering notices of his activity will be found in many works dealing with the Reformation.

PHARAOH. See EGYPT, I., 2, § 4.

PHARISEES AND SADDUCEES.

Importance; Sources of Knowledge (§ 1).
Derivation of "Pharisee" (§ 2).
Derivation of "Sadducee" (§ 3).
Date of Origin (§ 4).
Relations of Pharisees and Scribes (§ 5).
Sadducees as Aristocrats (§ 6).
Relation of Pharisees to Jewish Nationalism (§ 7).
Relation of Sadducees to Nationalism (§ 8).
Religious Characteristics (§ 9).
Theological Differences (§ 10).
Legal and Dogmatic Differences (§ 11).
Relation of Pharisaism to Religion (§ 12).

The great importance of a proper understanding of the two parties thus named for the history of the later Judaism and of primitive Christianity is not to be misconceived. The entire history of the Jews and of their literature from the Maccabean wars until the destruction of Jerusalem is dominated by this partizan antithesis. The history of Jesus himself and of the original Church are largely thereby conditioned, since it was particularly in conflict with the Pharisees that the doctrine, self-witness, and whole active career of Jesus took shape as they did, while over against a Pharisaism which pushed its way even into Christianity the Apostle Paul had to defend the right of his mission to the gentiles, and the universality of Christian salvation. All the more serious, then, that the sources toward knowledge of those parties can be utilized only under difficulties. The Old-Testament books of Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles, Esther, and Daniel, are pertinent merely in relation to the preliminary history of the same. And only in sparing measure can even the Old-Testament Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha (qq.v.) be employed; among the latter, chiefly the Psalms of Solomon (see PSEUDEPIGRAPHA, II., 1). In the Gospels and in Acts a few dogmatic differences are mentioned as between Pharisees and Sadducees; but this allows no certain deduction respecting the fundamental and distinctive character of either party. Even the invectives of Jesus against the Pharisees have had reference to outgrowths of their trend, and are not to influence a judgment of their actual essence. What data Acts and the Pauline epistles contain by way of defining the Pharisaical anti-Pauline Jewish Christians, warrant only slight *a posteriori* deductions regarding Pharisaism. Doubtless the most valuable intelligence concerning the Pharisees and Sadducees is given by Josephus, whose data are appreciably colored (cf. Baumgarten, *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*, IX., 616 sqq.; Paret, in *TSK*, 1856, pp. 809 sqq.) by his own attenuated Pharisaism and by his effort to present Jewish conditions in the most favorable light before the Greek and Roman world. Patristic data are strongly dependent on Josephus, and are, furthermore, untrustworthy. The Jewish talmudic literature is of great significance in the study of Pharisaism since it is itself elicited by the Pharisaic spirit. Yet its anecdotal details about the history of the Pharisees and Sadducees are almost wholly valueless, being conceived from the standpoint of the later Jewish scholasticism. Yet despite this dearth of sources, they still afford a fairly distinct portraiture of the two parties.

1. Importance; Sources of Knowledge.

The names of the two parties throw some light on the origin and character of both parties. Touching the meaning of the name "Pharisee" there can exist no doubt. The Pharisees are certainly designated as the "separated" (cf. the Targums of Onkelos and Jonathan on Deut. xxxiii. 16; Josh. iii. 5)—those who by their prescriptive and ascetic sanctity hedged themselves apart from not only heathenism but also from the rest of Judaism. This explanation occurs even so early as in Suidas, in the Homilies of Clement (xi. 28), in Epiphanius (*Hær.*, xvi. 1), and Pseudo-Tertullian (*Hær.*, i.). The same is borne out by the abstract *Perishuth*, in Talmudic writings, in the signification of abstemiousness or exclusive ascetic piety; and by the Talmudic use of the term *Perischin*, in the reproachful sense of separatists. From the latter use and the avoidance of the term Pharisees in the thoroughly Pharisaic II Maccabees, one may infer that the name arose in hostile circles.

2. Derivation of "Pharisee."

The same is also probably true of the name "Sadducees." It is a mistake to derive the same from the Stoics (Köster, *TSK*, 1837, p. 164); more plausible is it to explain the Sadducees as *Ẓaddiḳim*, "the just," from their stress upon the simple law in contrast with Pharisaical traditions (Derenbourg); or their strictness in dealing penal sentences (Reville). Only on linguistic grounds, again, is there warrant for deriving the term (Gk. *Saddoukaios*, Heb. *Ẓadduḳi*), from a personal name of which no trace exists after the exile. Such a gratuitous hypothesis (Grätz, Montet, Legarde) can be justified only by extreme embarrassment. There is, on the other hand, great probability in favor of the hypothesis (Geiger), whereby the name is traced to that Zadok who was high priest in the time of David and Solomon, in whose line the high-priestly dignity continued during nearly the entire dominion of David's royal house (II Sam. viii. 17; I Kings i. 32; Ezek. xl. 46; Josephus, *Ant.*, X., viii. 6). In the period after the exile, not only the high priest Joshua (Neh. xl. 11; cf. I Chron vi.; Josephus, *Ant.*, X., viii. 6), but also, according to Josephus, all the high priests descending from him down to Menelaus, hence also all the high-priestly families of their lineage—belonged to the house of Zadok. According to this view the name "Sadducees" denotes the descendants of the high priest Zadok, together with their adherents. Which theory is also favored by analogy of the "Boëthusians," who in the Talmudic writings appear as an offshoot of the Sadducees; or as a sect akin to them. For the "Boëthusians" can be named Sadducees only through the circumstance that Herod the Great adopted the line of the Alexandrine Boëthos, whose granddaughter he married, into the succession of the high-priestly families (Josephus, *Ant.*, XV., ix. 3). If the name Sadducees denotes the Zadokites, it is impossible to deny all actual connection with the Zadokite high-priestly families, and to identify them with the Maccabean princes and their following, who had obtained that name only by way of reproach (Wellhausen). It is probable that the name Zadokites was given to the party by their enemies; but this was possible only in case the real Zadokite high priests formed the stock of the party; so that a partizan following could then readily join the same. In this light, the two party names of Pharisees and Sadducees are distinct in so far as that the former has reference to religious aims, the latter to connection with the high-priestly nobility. This does not controvert the correctness of the given derivation; indeed, the point becomes thereby more prominent that the Pharisaical party structure took its departure from religious motives; the Sadducean, predominantly from aristocratic interests.

3. Derivation of "Sadducees."

Partizan opposition between Pharisees and Sadducees probably arose in the first decades of the Maccabean era. A Jewish tradition (in the *Baraitha* to Rabbi Nathan's *Aboth*), respecting the founding of the Sadducees' party through two pupils of Antigonus of Socho, would carry the origins back to the close of the second century B.C. But apart from other improbabilities in this account, which dates only from the Middle Ages, its chronological correctness is precluded by the certified existence of the Sadducees' cause at a considerably earlier period. According to Josephus (*Ant.*, XIII., x. 6), an open conflict between Pharisees and Sadducees broke out as early as toward the close of the administration of Hyrcanus, about 115 B.C. But this presupposes an antecedent and quiet development of both parties, and Hyrcanus himself was brought up in the Pharisaic doctrine (Josephus, *Ant.*, XIII., x. 5). Essentially opposite is the incidental remark of Josephus in his narrative of the last executive years of Jonathan (*Ant.*, XIII., v. 9), that about that time there were three "sects" among the Jews: Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes. The origin of the Pharisees and Sadducees falls, therefore, at its latest, during the rule of Jonathan; but it can not be set back much further, since no trace of their names appears earlier to show that the parties were forming. The assumption is forbidden that they arose before the Maccabean insurrection. Nor may appeal be made to the presence of the Hasideans (see HASMONEANS, § 1) in the pre-Maccabean period. For the Pharisees are not to be identified with these. While one can date the Pharisees and Sadducees as parties back to the beginning of the post-exilic period (A. Geiger, *Ursprung und Uebersetzung der Bibel*, pp. 26 sqq., 56 sqq., Breslau, 1857) only by resting upon conjecture, it is possible that the partizan antithesis but continued an older contention, such as might have taken shape prior to the Maccabean uprising; indeed, opposition of interests similar to these appeared in the pre-Maccabean era.

4. Date of Origin.

This first of all appears in the class distinction between the Pharisees and Sadducees. Soon after the return, there began to develop an opposition between the scribes, who insisted upon an absolutely strict prescriptive life, and the adherents of the aristocratic high-priestly lines, who favored the gentiles. This antithesis accentuated itself in the Syrian and Hellenistic era, and led to the formation of parties during the rule of Antiochus Epiphanes. At that time the rising party of radical Hellenism, which sought to supplant Mosaic Judaism by Greek manners and customs, was withstood by the coterie of the Hasideans, who determined to adhere with the utmost rigor to the Jewish law as the unconditional norm of life. At that time the leaders of the former party were the high-priestly aristocrats; those of the second, the scribes. A similar class distinction formed the basis of the conflict between Pharisees and Sadducees. True, the Pharisees are not identical with the scribes. From Acts xxiii. 9, it appears that in the apostolic age not all scribes were Pharisees, but that there were also Sadducee or neutral scribes; and only a portion of the Pharisees consisted of scribes (Mark ii. 16; Luke v. 30). Indeed, a characteristic distinction comes forth in the very use of the two terms in the Gospels. Quite often they speak of the Pharisees, where only individuals of that sect are meant (Matt. ix. 19–34, etc.). On the

5. Relations of Pharisees and Scribes.

other hand, where the matter turns on particular scribes, the text mentions " certain of the scribes " (Matt. ix. 3, xii. 38, etc.). Only where the scribes are named in conjunction with the Pharisees is the general expression used for the former with reference to individuals (Mark ii. 16; Luke v. 30, etc.). On the contrary, " the scribes," without other qualification, is never used of individuals, but everywhere only of the entire category (Matt. vii. 29, xvii. 10, etc.). Hence the scribes are conceived as a class; the Pharisees as a compact party, such as is represented even in the case of individual members. Occasionally in the addresses of Jesus to the scribes and Pharisees there is to be remarked the distinctive reference to the learned legal science of the former and the prescriptive manner of life advanced by the latter. So the scribes appear as theorists in contrast with the Pharisees as practitioners. For the most part, however, the two were likely to be united in one and the same person. This close affinity between Pharisees and scribes crops out alike in Josephus, in the New Testament, and in the Talmud. Where Josephus speaks of Jewish scribes, he generally implies that they are adherents of the Pharisaic school (*War*, I., xxxiii. 2–3, II., xvii. 8; *Ant.*, XVII., vi. 2). Conversely, where he brings the Pharisees into his narrative, he assumes that they make disciples and give instruction in the law, hence are scribes (*Ant.*, XIII., x. 6). Again, certain scribes well known and eminent in Talmudic sources, he designates as Pharisees (*Ant.*, XV., i. 1, x. 4; *Life*, xxxviii.). In the New Testament, the scribes and Pharisees are now grouped together in the discourses of Jesus (Matt. v. 20, xxiii. 2 sqq.; cf. Luke vii. 30), and are introduced as acting in common (Matt. xii. 38, and elsewhere). Moreover, the two designations often vary in parallel passages, as well as in the relation of the same Gospel. Lastly, the post-Maccabean scribes of the Mishna speak of one another as the " Learned " (*ḥakamim*); whereas in the controversial objections of the Sadducees they are termed " Pharisees " (*Judaim*, iv. 6, 7, 8) and advocate Pharisaic views. From all this it is to be assumed that the Pharisees were composed of the leading scribes and their following, and were the practical exponents of the theoretical knowledge of the law.

6. Sadducees as Aristocrats.

On the contrary, the Sadducees, like the Hellenists of the pre-Maccabean era, had their nucleus in the Jewish aristocracy. Those magnates (" mighty ones "; Josephus, *Ant.*, XIII., vi. 2; cf. *War*, I., v. 3), who as counselors of Alexander Jannæus were by him endowed with the highest honors, but were thrust aside by Queen Salome Alexandra, were undoubtedly Sadducees. For their persecution took place under the Pharisees' rule of terror. In his general depiction of the Sadducees, Josephus says expressly that they had only the rich on their side, but not the common people (*Ant.*, XIII., x. 6), that this doctrine won but few, but they the first in dignity (*Ant.*, XVIII., i. 4). And in the Psalms of Solomon, wherein the joy of the Pharisaic circles over the downfall of the Sadducees in the year 69 B.C. finds distinct vent, the latter are described as eye-serving courtiers and unjust judges (iv. 1–10, ii. 3–5). Hence the Sadducees' aristocratic character is distinctive and proper. But if Josephus (*Life*, i.) designates the priests in general as the nobility of the Jewish people, at all events this does not apply in a social connection. And it is erroneous (Geiger, Hausrath, Montet) to suppose that the Sadducees represented the interests of the priesthood on a preponderant scale; there lay no intrinsic objection in the nature of Pharisaism to the priesthood as such, and there appear to have been not a few priestly Pharisees (cf. Josephus, *Life*, i.–ii., xxxix.; *Mishna Eduyoth*, ii. 6–7, viii. 2; *Aboth*, ii. 8, iii. 2; *Shekalim*, iv. 4, vi. 1). It was rather the high-priestly families that offset the rest of the priesthood in the manner of a distinctive aristocracy. Under the Maccabean Simon, the adherents thereof effected their reception into the senate; while in the time of Pompey, they sat and voted in the sanhedrim (Ps. of Sol., iv. 2), which had grown out of the earlier senate, and represented a remnant of political independence, while their influence here was limited by the unaristocratic assessors of the scribes' class, yet in a certain measure it was secured by the fact that the high priests, who now constantly belonged to their circles, held the presidency in the sanhedrim. These " chief priests," as the officiating and former high priests, together with their kindred, are called in the New Testament (Schürer, in *TSK*, 1872, pp. 614 sqq.), are therefore at once the most important element of the Jewish aristocracy, and the proper nucleus of the Sadducean party. Josephus mentions only incidentally of Ananus that he belonged to the Sadducees (*Ant.*, XX., ix. 1). In the Psalms of Solomon the Sadducee members of the sanhedrim appear as unworthy directors of the temple worship (i. 8, ii. 1–5, viii. 12). In Acts the Sadducees are expressly designated as those empowered with dispensing penal correction (iv. 1–3), as also the high priest's party (v. 17). Certain reminders of the Sadducaic complexion of the high priest's retinue occur in talmudic sources (cf. Geiger, ut sup., pp. 109 sqq.).

7. Relation of Pharisees to Jewish Nationalism.

In keeping with this class distinction between Pharisees and Sadducees is the national attitude of the two parties. One may not think of the Sadducees as the national and patriotic party; of the Pharisees, on the contrary, as an unattached, international society. To the Pharisees might better be applied the term " national "; they were more frequently the opposers of the oppressors of the people. It is to the Pharisees that Rabbi Hillel's word applies: " Do not separate thyself from the congregation " (*Pirke Aboth*, ii. 4); and they desired that the benefits of the theocracy should benefit all, without exception (II Macc. ii. 17). Hence the Pharisees had not only the women on their side (Josephus, *Ant.*, XVII., ii. 4), but the masses generally (*Ant.*, XIII., x. 6). Yet on another side one may not perceive in them the healthy citizenship, the true kernel of the people, the truly national party. As a faction of the scribes, they pursued only distinctively religious aims. It was merely in a religious connection that they desired the welfare of the people and

the maintenance of what was peculiarly Jewish. And if they sought to extend their leadership over all other spheres of life, their sole motive was that these might thus become dominated by the thoroughly prescriptive form of their religious aims. There resulted an externally theocratic trend of policy, and this was naturally contradicted by a totally non-Jewish government; so that, theoretically, the Pharisees did not concede the legality of tribute to such a régime (Matt. xxii. 17). They endured government by a heathen power as brought about by the divine providence, but only in the expectation of its future downfall. And the hatred latent in such an attitude easily converted itself into fanatical deeds. But yet again, they could sacrifice the theocratical idea to an untheocratical Jewish prince like Alexander Jannæus. Furthermore, how little the Pharisees were disposed to bridge the gap between priesthood and people appears from their especially strict precepts regarding the tithe and other dues in favor of priests and Temple. Indeed, they set themselves over against the people with the utmost exclusiveness as a spiritual aristocracy, from which arose their party name, "the separated," the haughty behavior charged to their reproach by Jesus (Matt. xxiii. 5 sqq.), and the contempt with which they looked down upon the rest of the people as ignorant, not knowing the law, and unclean (John vii. 49; cf. the "Letter of Aristeas," dating from the time of Herod, in E. Kautsch, *Apokryphen*, ii. 67, 140 sqq., Tübingen, 1900). So the Pharisees' popularity among the common people had yet its limits.

8. Relation of Sadducees to Nationalism.

Still less, however, is a national and patriotic attitude to be discerned in the case of the Sadducees. Their connection with the Hasmoneans (q.v.) came about only as the administration of the same lost its incipiently Jewish national character. The goal of their political action was, first of all, the strengthening of their aristocratic caste. Only as dictated to them through this class interest, did they stand on the national side. The circumstance that the first Hasmonean who ruled after the transition of Hyrcanus to the Sadducees' party, Aristobulus I., was surnamed the "Philhellene," throws light on their Hellenistic tendency. Subsequently, they became servile friends of the Romans. All the more overbearing and hard-hearted were they at that time in regard to the common people (Josephus, *War*, II., viii. 14; *Ant.*, XX., ix. 1). Hence their unpopularity was so great that, in order to "make themselves possible" at all, they had to govern, in the administration of their offices, according to Pharisaic principles (Josephus, *Ant.*, XVIII., i. 4). Nevertheless, neither Pharisees nor Sadducees were of an antinational character directly. The Pharisees did not manifest that purely separatistic demeanor of the Hasideans or of the Essenes. Neither were the Sadducees willing, like the radical Hellenists of the pre-Maccabean era, to surrender the people's national existence, its faith and its law. Obviously, then, after the founding of the legally national Maccabean state, the extreme elements of both the previously existing tendencies were eliminated. The most partizan among the Hasideans receded into small groups, which led eventually to the formation of the Essenes' order. And the radical Hellenists perished in the conflicts with the Maccabeans. Thus the more moderate elements were left over, and they merged, in turn, into the broad stream of the popular life whence they had originally issued.

9. Religious Characteristics.

With this alteration of parties, however, the fundamental religious trend persisted. The Pharisees, like the pre-Maccabean party of scribes, assiduously cultivated a strictly legalistic piety, holding themselves aloof from the world (Josephus, *War*, II., viii. 14; *Ant.*, XVII., ii. 4; *Life*, xxxviii.; Acts xxiii. 3, xxvi. 5; Phil. iii. 5). Religion determined all their aims. But they set the essence of religion in the knowledge and fulfilment of the law. From this one-sided and legal drift of their piety there emerged all the defects and excesses of the same, such as are exhibited quite sharply in the New Testament. They built or garnished the sepulchers of the prophets (Matt. xxiii. 29 sqq.), but had none of their spirit; they zealously disputed over their prophecies (Luke xvii. 20), but their belief in the same simply sanctified their venality. They labored zealously for the propagation of their faith (Matt. xxiii. 15), but only in behalf of outward results (cf. Sieffert, *Die Heidenbekehrung im Alten Testament und im Judenthum*, pp. 43 sqq., 1908; see Proselytes). Their faith was no inwardly liberating power, so that for them the law was but an enslaving yoke (John viii. 32; cf. Gal. v. 1). Out of this came the minute and anxious manner of fulfilling the law (Matt. xxiii. 23), the externalizing of the entire religious and moral life, the mechanicalism of their prayer (Matt. vi. 5 sqq.), the stress upon fasting (Matt. ix. 14); valuation of conspicuous borders to their garments, and broad phylacteries (Matt. xxiii. 5), the literalness of service in observing the sabbath (Matt. xii. 2, 9–13; Luke xiii. 10 sqq., xiv. 4 sqq.; John v. 1 sqq., ix. 14 sqq.). From this source arose their prescriptions of cleanliness (Matt. xv. 2, xxiii. 25; Mark vii. 2 sqq.; Luke xi. 38 sqq.), their preference for external acts of devotion above the plainest duties (Matt. xv. 5; Mark vii. 11 sqq.). This was indeed a straining at gnats and swallowing of camels (Matt. xxiii. 24). Of course, it was possible to practise all this in good faith and with honest sentiments. This is evidenced by the examples of Nicodemus, Joseph of Arimathea, and in particular, too, by that of Paul, who even though recalling his bygone disquietude with aversion (Rom. vii. 7 sqq.), yet thinks back without shame to his Pharisaic past (Phil. iii. 5 sqq.; Acts xxiii. 6, xxvi. 5). Only often enough that emphasis upon external acts led to complete self-satisfaction (Matt. xix. 16 sqq.; Luke xviii. 10) and to ostentation of piety (Matt. vi. 5 sqq., 16, xv. 7 sqq.; Mark vii. 6, xii. 40; Luke xx. 47), extending even to the endeavor to conceal the lack of inner moral integrity by means of the outward show of devout deportment (Matt. xxiii. 25 sqq.; Luke xi. 39 sqq.). In the Talmud, besides, there occur not a few beautiful sentences, urging toward right thinking and true humanity (especially in *Pirke Aboth*). But

they stand isolated in a wilderness of external precepts which smother the spirit of the law in their casuistical forcing of its letter. In distinction from all this, the Sadducees evinced a strong inclination toward other than Jewish manners; and, consistently with this trait, they were fain to guard the advantages of their social standing, their culture and possessions, from prejudice in the way of a troublesome piety. They were charged with leading an effeminate mode of life (Josephus, *Ant.*, XVIII., i. 3). The fourth of the Psalms of Solomon gives a picture, inspired by Pharisaism, of the worldly, even dissolute, life of the Sadducees and of their hypocritical show of pious ardor. And a late rabbinical tradition (*Aboth* of Rabbi Nathan) tells of their luxury in the article on tableware, and their scoffing at the economy of the worrying Pharisees.

10. Theological Differences.

This also affords a ready key to the particular theological disputes between the Pharisees and Sadducees. From the different fundamental religious trend of the two parties there most immediately results their antithetical relation toward that oral tradition which had been early created by the scribes of the past age, through exposition and application of the law, for a sort of hedge to the same (Josephus, *Ant.*, XIII., xvi. 2; Matt. xv 2; Mark vii. 3). This tradition was made of binding force by the Pharisees; by the Sadducees it was rejected (Josephus, *Ant.*, XIII., x. 6). Through their endeavor to regulate the whole of human life, down to every detail, by means of the law, the Pharisees were led to lay great stress on enlarging the scope of the same by tradition, even to ascribe a paramount importance to the latter in comparison with the less exactly defined law (Mishnah, *Sanhedrin*, xi. 3). Ultimately, therefore, tradition, like the law, came to be traced back to Moses (*Pirke Aboth*, i. 11 sqq.), and so came the possibility of invalidating a legal provision by virtue of a traditional precept (cf. Mark vii. 11). Moreover, the Sadducees did not altogether avoid developing an exegetical school tradition, partly diverging from the tradition of the Pharisees (*Megillath Taanit*, 10); partly, indeed, accordant with it (*Sandehrin*, xxxiii. 6. *Horayoth* 4*a*). But while they admitted no authority transcending the law, they so emphasized independence of judgment that they made it a boast to contradict their teachers themselves as far as possible (Josephus, *Ant.*, XVIII., i. 4). But their principled rejection of legal tradition resulted partly from their opposition to the Pharisaic scribes, partly from their desire to be constrained as little as possible through legal regulations. Hence they repudiated all refining deductions from the law, and appealed simply to the letter thereof, which was easier to circumvent. Thus the letter of the law became for them their only categorical religious principle. Sometimes, again, they enforced the strictness of the letter, in contrast with its attenuation; particularly in imposing penal sentences, they were "more hard-hearted than all other Jews" (Josephus, *Ant.*, XX., ix. 1). Jesus himself experienced this hard-heartedness on the part of his Sadducee judges.

11. Legal and Dogmatic Differences.

This divergent attitude of the Pharisees and Sadducees in respect to the letter of the law and to tradition, also explains a number of the particular legal disputes which are attributed to them in Talmudic sources, many of which are historical. In certain cases the Sadducees, as it appears, represented the priesthood; in the rest, a definite principle of opposition is not to be ascertained. To be noted also are some dogmatic differences, among which the most important was the one touching the doctrine of resurrection; not, as Josephus presents it in Hellenizing fashion (*War*, II., viii. 14; *Ant.*, XVIII., i. 3, 4), the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. If the Sadducees rejected the doctrine in question, they advocated the older position of Judaism. For the like doctrine was not at all proposed in the earlier Old-Testament Scriptures, and not with complete distinctness before its appearance in the Book of Daniel. The Sadducees' position was reinforced by their directly practical contemplation of earthly conditions. On the other hand, the fact that the Pharisees decidedly espoused the doctrine of resurrection was quite in accord with their very diligent fostering of hopes in the Messiah, which hopes, like their doctrine itself, on account of their avaricious temperament, assumed a strongly sensual cast. In like manner the doctrine concerning angels, which had been elaborated by the Pharisaic scribes on the basis of the Old Testament, was rejected by the Sadducees (Acts xxiii. 8) consistently with their preoccupation with mundane affairs. According to Josephus the Pharisees and Sadducees also diverged in their conception as to the relation between destiny and human free-will (*War*, II., viii. 14; *Ant.*, XIII., v. 9, XVIII., i. 3). This seems to indicate that the Pharisees, in their religious decisiveness, made everything dependent on divine providence; whereas the Sadducees, as men of practical affairs, deducted the elements of welfare and calamity from human transactions.

12. Relation of Pharisaism to Religion.

The further development of the religious life could not attach itself to the materialistic and worldly bent of the Sadducees, but only to Pharisaism, which, however legalistic, traditional, and mercenary, was yet distinguished by a certain religious potentiality, as appears from the relation of primitive Christianity to both parties. The contact between Christianity and the Sadducees' party was but slight and external. Enraged at the Christian revival of the hope of resurrection, and threatened in their hierarchical position by the Messianic claims of Jesus and the accordant expectations of the Apostolic Church, the Sadducees persecuted both those teachings with scorn and violence. With Pharisaism, however, Christianity had to reach an understanding on inward grounds quite from the start. Proceeding from the common platform of the law and the Messianic hopes, Jesus attacked the formalism of the Pharisees and their entire externalizing of the moral and religious life in that he coupled the profoundest vitalization of the same with the renovating forces which emanated from

his own person. The hatred that he thereby brought upon himself on the part of the Pharisees also frenzied the popular masses. But when afterward in the apostolic congregation the proclaiming of Christ's resurrection pushed to the foreground, overshadowing, in a manner, the content of his own preaching, Pharisaism's antithesis to Christianity receded so far behind the vehement persecution of the same through the Sadducees, that it now became feasible for Pharisaic elements to make their way into the Christian assembly (Acts xv. 1 sqq.). It was only where the logical issues of Christianity became voiced in direct opposition to an absolute enforcement of the law (somewhat reservedly, at first, by the deacon Stephen, afterward more vigorously and with practical application by the Apostle Paul) that the Pharisaic enmity awoke, in utter bitterness. However, it was precisely his own Pharisaic training in youth that moved the Apostle Paul, after his radical breach with his past, to engage in a conflict with the Pharisaic party, not only outside, but especially within Christianity; wherein he prevailed to illustrate the peculiar principles of Christianity in contrast with the legal religion of the Old Testament, in a degree equaled by no other apostle. F. SIEFFERT.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. Wellhausen, *Die Pharisäer und die Sadducäer*, Greifswald, 1874; A. Geiger, *Sadducäer und Pharisäer*, Breslau, 1863; idem, in *Jüdische Zeitschrift*, ii (1863), 11–54; M. Friedländer, *Die religiösen Bewegungen innerhalb des Judentums im Zeitalter Jesu*, Berlin, 1905. Consult further: Grossmann, *De Judæorum disciplina arcani*, Leipsic, 1833–41; idem, *De philosophia Sadducæorum*, ib. 1836–38; *De Pharisæismo Judæorum Alexandrino*, ib. 1846–50; *De collegio Pharisæorum*, ib. 1851; A. F. Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, i. 309 sqq., Stuttgart, 1838; J. A. B. Lutterbeck, *Die neutestamentlichen Lehrbegriffe*, i. 157–222, Mainz, 1852; I. M. Jost, *Geschichte des Judenthums und seiner Secten*, i. 197 sqq., 216 sqq., Leipsic; 1857–59; A. Müller, in the *Sitzungsberichte* of the Vienna Academy, philosoph.-historical class, xxxiv (1860), 95–164; J. Derenbourg, *Hist. de la Palestine*, pp. 75–78, 119–144, 452–456, Paris, 1867; Hanne, in *ZWT*, 1867, pp. 131-179, 239–263; A. Hausrath, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, i. 129 sqq., Heidelberg, 1868, Eng. transl., *Hist. of the N. T. Times*, 4 vols., London, 1895; A. Kuenen, *De Godsdienst van Israel*, ii. 338–371, 456 sqq., 2 vols., Haarlem, 1869–70; J. Cohen, *Les Pharisiens*, 2 vols., Paris, 1877; A. M. Fairbairn, *Studies in the Life of Christ*, pp. 165 sqq., London, 1881; Baneth, in *Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judentums*, ix (1882), 1–37, 61–95; J. Hamburger, *Real-encyclopädie für Bibel und Talmud*, ii. 1038 sqq., Strelitz, 1882; E. Montet, *Essai sur les origines des parties saducéen et pharisien*, Paris, 1883; idem, in *JA*, 1887, pp. 415–423; R. Mackintosh, *Christ and the Jewish Law*, pp. 39 sqq., London, 1885; F. Weber, *Die Lehren des Talmud*, Leipsic, 1886; idem, *Jüdische Theologie auf Grund des Talmud und verwandter Schriften*, pp. 10–14, 44–46, ib. 1897; E. Davaine, *Le Sadducéisme*, Montauban, 1888; A. Jülicher, *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*, ii. 54 sqq., 549 sqq., Freiburg, 1888–89; A. B. Bruce, *Kingdom of God*, pp. 187 sqq., Edinburgh, 1889; J. L. Narbel, *Étude sur le parti pharisien*, Lausanne, 1891; H. E. Ryle, and M. R. James, *Psalms of Solomon*, pp. xlviii.-lii., Cambridge, 1891; J. F. W. Bousset, *Jesu Predigt in ihrem Gegensatz zum Judentum*, Göttingen, 1892; idem, *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*, pp. 161–168, Berlin, 1903; Krüger, in *TQ*, lxxxv (1894), 431–496; O. Holtzmann, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, pp. 158 sqq., Freiburg, 1895; A. Bertholet, *Die Stellung der Israeliten und der Juden zu den Fremden*, pp. 123–256, Tübingen, 1896; I. Elbogen, *Die Religionsanschauung der Pharisäer*, Berlin, 1904; S. Schechter, *Die Chassidim*, Berlin, 1904; G. Hölscher, *Der Sadduzäismus. Eine kritische Untersuchung zur späteren Judenreligionsgeschichte*, Leipsic, 1906; S. Bamberger. *Sadducäer in ihren Beziehungen zu Alexander Jannai und Salome*, Frankfort, 1907; Schürer, *Geschichte*, ii. 380–419, Eng. transl., II., ii. 1–43 (contains bibliography); *DB*, iii. 821–829, iv. 349–352; *EB*, iv. 4234–40, 4321–29; *JE*, ix. 661–666, x. 630–633; *KL*, ix. 1990–96; Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire*, part xxxi., pp. 206–218; Jacobus, *Dictionary*, pp. 666–668, 760–761. Magazine literature is indicated in Richardson, *Encyclopaedia*, pp. 848, 969; the subject is treated also in the more important works on the life of Christ, such as those of Farrar (Excursuses IX.–XIV.), Edersheim, and Keim, and in those on the history of the Jews, as in Ewald and Grätz.

PHARMAKIDES, THEOKLITOS: Modern Greek theologian and ecclesiastical statesman; b. at Larissa, Thessaly, Jan. 25, 1784; d. at Athens Apr. 21, 1860. With but meager education, he was ordained deacon at Larissa in 1802 and priest at Bucharest in 1811, after which he was in charge of the Greek church in Vienna for some eight years. Here he was brought into contact not only with his compatriots who were interested in the revival of the Greek nation, but also with the philhellene Frederick North, fifth earl of Guilford, who wished him to accept a theological professorship in the projected university of Corfu. Pharmakides accordingly studied for two years at Göttingen, but returned to Greece on the outbreak of the Greek war for independence. Here he was active until his death in the reorganization of the national church and the establishment of an educational system. Circumstances, however, hampered his efforts until 1833 when the Bavarian regency made him president of the committee to investigate the condition of the Greek Church. As secretary of the Synod of Nauplia, he was the main factor in securing the declaration of independence of the Greek Church in the same year. The conservative influence was, however, too strong for him, and after writing his "On Zechariah, son of Berechiah" (Athens, 1838), "The Pseudonymous German" (1838), and "On the Oath" (1840), he was removed from his secretariate in 1839 and appointed professor of philology. He now published in his own defense his "Apology" (Athens, 1840), and unremittingly continued the struggle for the freedom of the Greek Church. His program was finally carried out, aided largely by his "The Synodic Volume: or, Concerning Truth" (Athens, 1852), when, in 1852, the Greek Church was made entirely independent except for ecclesiastical prerogatives of honor accorded to the patriarch of Constantinople. After this last work, Pharmakides appeared little in public. At the time of his death he was working on a large historical polemic against the Roman Catholic Church. Among his earlier publications mention may be made of his commentary on the New Testament (7 vols., Athens, 1844). (PHILIPP MEYER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Biographical matter is found in the "Apology," ut sup. Consult: "Evangelical Herald," pp. 203–216, Athens, 1860; G. L. von Maurer, *Das griechische Volk*, vol. ii., Heidelberg, 1835; C. A. Brandis, *Mitteilungen über Griechenland*, vol. iii., Leipsic, 1842; R. Nicolai, *Geschichte der neugriechischen Literatur*, ib. 1876; G. F. Hertzberg, *Geschichte Griechenlands*, vols. iii.–iv., Gotha, 1878; *TSK*, 1841, pp. 7–53.

PHELONION: See VESTMENTS AND INSIGNIA, ECCLESIASTICAL.

PHELPS, AUSTIN: American Congregationalist; b. at West Brookfield, Mass., Jan. 7, 1820; d.

at Bar Harbor, Me., Oct. 13, 1890. He graduated at the University of Pennsylvania in 1837, and studied at Andover and Union Theological seminaries; was pastor of Pine Street Church, Boston, 1842–48, and professor of sacred rhetoric at Andover Theological Seminary, 1848–79, and president from 1869. He was a master of English, and distinguished in his teaching and writing. He published *The Still Hour* (Boston, 1859); *Hymns and Choirs* (Andover, 1860); *The New Birth* (Boston, 1867); *Sabbath Hours* (1870); *Studies of the Old Testament* (1879); *The Theory of Preaching* (1881); *Men and Books* (1882); *My Portfolio* (1882); *English Style* (1883); *My Study* (1885); and *My Note Book* (1890).

Bibliography: E. S. Phelps, *Austin Phelps; a Memoir*, New York, 1891; D. L. Furber, in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, xlviii (1891), 545–585.

PHENICIA, PHENICIANS.

I. Geography and Topography.
General Description; Acre, Achzib (§ 1).
Region South of Tyre (§ 2).
Tyre (§ 3).
Region between Tyre and Sidon (§ 4).
Sidon (§ 5).
Sidon to Beirut (§ 6).
Beirut to al-Shakkai (§ 7).
Tripolis and Environs (§ 8).
Extreme Northern Phenicia (§ 9).
II. Names and Ethnology.
Names (§ 1).
Ethnology (§ 2).
III. Religion.
Deities (§ 1).
Cult (§ 2).
IV. History.
Till the Assyrian Period (§ 1).
Assyrian to the Roman Period (§ 2).
Trade and Discovery (§ 3).

I. Geography and Topography: The term Sidonions or Sidonians is employed in the Old Testament to denote the Phenicians (cf. I Kings v. 6, xvi. 31), though their country is called Phenicia or Phenice (I Esd. ii. 17 sqq.; II Macc. iii. 5, etc.; Acts xi. 19, xv. 3, xxi. 2).

1. General Description; Acre, Achzib. The boundaries of the country can not be determined definitely, for the scanty allusions to the Phenicians do not tell how far inland their domains extended. That they did extend inland is certain (cf. I Kings v. 9), and Josephus states (*Ant.*, XIII., v. 6; *War*, II., xviii. 1, IV., ii. 3) that the city of Cedasa or Cydyssa was a Tyrian stronghold on the border of Galilee. The Phenician coast falls into three natural divisions: southern Phenicia, from Ras al-Abjaḍ to the Nahr al-'Awali, north of Sidon; central Phenicia, from the Nahr al-'Awali to al-Shakkai; and northern Phenicia, from al-Shakkai to Ras ibn Hani or to Ras al-Basit. In ancient history the southern and the northern divisions are alone important. The Philistine conquests permanently separated the southern cities from association with the Phenicians, and deprived them of such cities as Joppa and Dor; not until the Persian rule did the Phenicians again control these regions. Before discussing Phenicia proper brief mention should be made of two cities, Acre and Achzib. The former lies on a steep promontory extending southward into the sea and forming a natural haven of medium size with the eastern edge of St. George's Bay. Owing to deposits of silt the harbor is deserted, and trade is diverted to the neighboring Haifa. In ancient times this city was of importance because of its haven and the roads connecting it with the interior, especially the "way of the sea" (Isa. ix. 1). The city is mentioned by Sethos I. under the name of 'Aka about 1320 B.C., and about 380 Artaxerxes Mnemon made it his base in his expedition against Egypt. Ptolemy II. Philadelphus refounded the city and named it Ptolemais. It passed into the possession of the Seleucids in 198 B.C., and was an important military center in the Maccabean wars. In 65 B.C. Pompey brought it under the Romans, for whom it constituted the most important harbor of Palestine. In 1103 A.D. it was taken by Baldwin I., given to Saladin in 1187, retaken by the crusaders in 1189, and destroyed by Sultan Malik al-Ashraf in 1291. Rebuilt in 1749, the city has slowly increased, despite the attack of Napoleon in 1799 and the bombardment of the united English, Austrian, and Turkish fleet in 1840, until it now contains a population of about 11,000. Some nine miles to the north, and not far from the coast, lies the small village al-Zib, representing the Achzib of Judges xix. 29. A quarter of an hour to the north is the spring of 'Ain al-Mashairfah, which has been compared with the Misrephoth-maim of Josh. xi. 8, xiii. 6.

2. Region South of Tyre. Here the Jabal al-Mushaḳḳaḥ approaches the coast, and the ascent to the promontory of Ras al-Naḳurah brings the traveler to Phenicia proper. To the north of the road stretches a small stony strip of coast in the form of a crescent to the second promontory, the Ras al-Abjaḍ, or "White Promontory." The valley between the two promontories shows ruins of two ancient sites, Umm al-'Amud and Iskandarunah, the former perhaps being the ancient Ramantha or Ramitha, the Greek Leuke Akte, later called Laodicea, and the latter dating back, at least in name, to the Roman Emperor Alexander Severus (222–235). In 1116 A.D. Iskandarunah was rebuilt by Baldwin I. as a base of operations against Tyre. The ancient road over the White Promontory runs for about forty minutes close to the declivity. In the course of centuries portions of it have been hewn in the rocks, and in especially steep places stone stairs have been cut, so that Josephus and the Talmud give as the ancient name of this road the "Tyrian Stairs."

North of the Ras al-Abjad a small plain extends between the shores and the foot of the mountains of Galilee. The streams are shallow and have little water, though good springs are occasionally found, especially about an hour south of Tyre in the Ras al-'Ain and ten minutes to the north, both about a quarter of an hour from the shore. Three other wells and an aqueduct, the latter apparently of Roman architecture, are found about fifteen minutes north of Ras al-'Ain. It was doubtless the springs of this promontory which first attracted the Phenicians, which they also used for their city.

The distance from Ras al-'Ain to Tyre is an

hour, and the plain with its sandy coast is one and a half miles broad. Modern Tyre, a town of some 6,000 inhabitants, lies on the northern side of a peninsula, while the ancient Phenician city was situated on an island. The prophet Ezekiel, like the Assyrian King Asshurbanipal, describes Tyre as built "in the midst of the seas" (xxviii. 2, cf. xxvii. 3–4, xxvi. 4), and the name itself means "rock." The island on which Tyre lay would seem to be the present peninsula where the modern town is situated. Of the buildings of the ancient city little is known. According to Menander of Ephesus (cf. Josephus, *Apion*, i. 18; *Ant.*, VIII., v. 3), Hiram I., the contemporary of Solomon, rebuilt the old temples. Special mention is made of the temple of Heracles (Melkarth) and Astarte, while Herodotus (ii. 44) refers to the temple of Thasian Heracles, which is probably identical with the Agenorium of Arrian (*Anabasis*, ii. 25–26). According to Menander and Dius, Hiram extended the city to the east and there constructed the great square, or Eurychorum. The ancient city had two harbors, the Sidonian to the north, and the Egyptian to the south. The former is now choked with sand, and the latter has entirely disappeared. On the main land opposite the island lay a city called Old Tyre by Menander, Strabo, Pliny, and others. It would seem, however, that the city in question was really called Ushu, a name occurring in the Amarna Tablets and the Assyrian inscriptions, and probably in the *Authu* of Egyptian monuments. The patron deity of the city was Usoos, who was said to have been the first to sail the sea on a tree trunk, while his brother, Samemrumus, built huts of reed in Tyre (see SANCHUNIATHON). This legend seems to imply that the island city of Tyre was settled from the mainland. The accounts of "Old Tyre" vary so widely that it is uncertain whether one or more places are meant, or whether sites are referred to which belong to different periods. Ancient Tyre, which seems to have had an important suburb at Ras al-Ma'shuḳ, ceased to be an island city in consequence of the siege by Alexander the Great in 332, when he constructed a vast mole, four stadia long and two plethra wide, from the mainland to the eastern side of the island (cf. Arrian, *Anabasis*, ii. 17 sqq.; Diodorus Siculus, xvii. 40). The walls, said to be over 150 feet high, rendered the mole useless at first, but the Greek fleet bottled up the Tyrian ships in the harbors, whereupon the troops of Alexander were able to storm the relatively weaker ramparts on the south. In the taking of the city Arrian states that 8,000 fell, while 30,000 were sold as slaves, figures which imply a dense population. Tyre was not wholly destroyed, however, by the Greek conqueror, and in 316–315 it was besieged in vain by Antigonus for fourteen months. Coming under Seleucid control in 198, it apparently bought its autonomy in 126, later restricted by Augustus. On his journey from Miletus to Jerusalem Paul found Christians at Tyre (Acts xxi. 3–6), and a bishop of Tyre, Cassius, is mentioned at the Synod of Cæsarea toward the end of the second century. The crusaders were in possession of the city 1124–91 A.D., after which the Sultan Malik al-Ashraf occupied the place. The history of modern Tyre begins in 1766, when a sheik named Hanzar settled in the ruins and rebuilt them. After the destructive earthquake of 1837 the buildings were reconstructed by Ibrahim Pasha.

3. Tyre.

The coast north of Tyre resembles that of the southern vicinity of the city. First the sandy shore, then a level plain stretching inland for about a mile, and then the beginning of the plateau of Galilee. Almost two hours north of Tyre is the mouth of the Nahr al-Ḳasimiyah, after which the strip of coast narrows, while the foothills are rich in tombs of various periods. At the foot of the range are traces of the old Roman road from Tyre to Sidon. North of the Wadi abu'l-Aswad is a ruined site called 'Adlun, apparently the town of Ornithopolis, mentioned by Strabo as a Sidonian colony. An hour farther north a promontory and a village bear the name of Ẓarafand, the Zarephath of the Bible (I Kings xvii. 9–10; Obadiah 20; Sarepta, Luke iv. 26). The Crusaders made Zarephath an episcopal see, and the Wali al-Khiḍr is held to mark the abode of the prophet Elijah. From Zarafand the coast bends westward, the first great rivers from the western slope of the Lebanon being found in the Nahr al-Zaharani and the Nahr Sanik. The gardens now begin, and become more numerous and more beautiful the closer the traveler approaches Ẓaida, the ancient Sidon.

4. Region between Tyre and Sidon.

The modern city of Ẓaida is situated on a flat promontory between 200 and 300 yards wide, with a small rocky peninsula, 600 yards long. The northern quarter and a series of reefs and islands protect the inner harbor, while to the eastward stretches the outer harbor, which was used as an anchorage in summer. The peninsula bears the remains of ancient walls, and similar ruins are found on an island to the north of the harbor and on other reefs. The Phenician Sidon extended some 700 yards farther east than the modern town. The basalt sarcophagus of King Eshmunazar was discovered in 1855 ten minutes southeast of the city; in 1887, near the village of al-Halaliyah, seventeen magnificent Phenician and Greek sarcophagi were found, among them those of Tabnit, father of Eshmunazar, and the alleged sarcophagus of Alexander the Great. Excavations since 1900 have revealed a temple of Eshmun on the Nahr al-'Awali, also ancient aqueducts. In the Old Testament a "Great Sidon" is mentioned (Josh. xi. 8, xix. 28). This phrase is repeated on the Taylor cylinder with the words "Little Sidon" beside it, though the basis of the distinction is as yet unknown. The ancient city of Sidon was destroyed by Artaxerxes Ochus in 348 B.C. Yet after Alexander and during the Roman period Sidon remained an important city. Paul, on his way to Rome, found Christians there (Acts xxvii. 3), and the bishop of Sidon attended the Nicene Council of 325. Later the city declined and in 637–638 surrendered to the Mohammedans without resistance. During the crusades it was repeatedly taken and refortified, last by Louis IX. of France in 1253. Seven years later it was sacked by the Mongols, and in 1291 came under the control of Malik al-

5. Sidon.

Ashraf. Early in the seventeenth century Sidon was revived by the Druse Prince Fakhr al-Din. It likewise enjoyed the protection of Ibrahim Pasha of Egypt, but in 1840 was attacked by the fleet of the European allies.

6. Sidon to Beirut.

The little plain about Sidon stretches to the north about to the Nahr al-'Awali, from the north side of which, about a half-hour from the city, the district of the Lebanon comprises the coast until near Ṭarabulus, or Tripolis, with the exception of Beirut and its immediate vicinity. This valley and the comparatively low passes near by were doubtless used in antiquity as the shortest road from Sidon to Damascus. The coast now becomes more stony, with no coast plain. Between the Ras Jedrah and the Ras al-Damur the towns of Platanus (or Platana) and Porphyreum must have lain, where Antiochus the Great defeated the general of Ptolemy IV Philopator in 218 B.C. North of the Ras al-Damur is the mouth of the Nahr al-Damur, the Damuras, Demarus, or Tamyras of the ancients. A conspicuous point on the coast is the promontory of Beirut (Ras Bairut), with the city of the same name at its foot. To the east is a small well-populated plain on the banks of the Nahr Bairut, the ancient Magoras, as well as on the coast, which runs about six miles to the east and forms St. George's Bay. The background is formed by the steep terraces of Lebanon with green valleys, neat farm houses, and small villages on the lower slopes, higher up remnants of the once famous forests, and at the summit a bare sharp ridge. In ancient Phenicia the city was of no importance, though its name, which apparently means "wells," occurs in the Amarna Tablets, which designate the place as the seat of the Egyptian vassal Ammunira. Beirut attained prominence as the Roman Colonia Julia Augusta Felix Berytus. It was famed for its school of law and for its silk-weaving until it was damaged by the earthquake of 529. Its second period of prosperity began when the Druse Prince Fakhr al-Din (1595–1634) made it his chief residence. It is now the center of trade and commerce for the entire Syrian coast, especially as it has been connected with Damascus since 1895 by a railway. The city is the center of Syrian Christian culture, represented by American Presbyterian (The Syrian Protestant College) and Jesuit institutions of learning, and by German Protestant benevolent organizations. The British Syrian mission also maintains a series of schools, the Scotch mission works chiefly among Jews, Mohammedans, and Druses, while various French religious orders labor for the education of the natives and the care of the sick. This activity has spurred the non-Christian Syrians to establish schools. Beirut is the seat of a wali and contains about 120,000 inhabitants.

Some two and a half miles east of Beirut the coast resumes its northerly course and soon reaches the mouth of the Nahr al-Kalb, the Lycus of the classics. The mountains here touch the water, and are crossed by the coast roads. The present road and railway from Beirut to the north is the closest to the sea level. Some ninety feet higher is the Roman road constructed by Marcus Aurelius about 176–180 A.D. Higher still three Egyptian and six Assyrian inscriptions or sculptures show that armies were led across this promontory over a much steeper, but more accessible road, by Rameses II. about 1300, Tiglath-Pileser I. about 1140, Shalmaneser II. about 850, Sennacherib in 702, and Esarhaddon in 670 (see ASSYRIA, VI., 3, §§ 3, 7, 13). Later still, Greek, Roman, crusading, and Mohammedan armies passed over these roads, and finally the soldiers of the French expedition of 1860. The railway runs along the road to Ma'amiltain on the Bay of Juniyah. From this point the old road again follows the coast, and at the northern end of the bay is hewn through the rock. An hour and a half farther to the north is the Nahr Ibrahim, the classical Adonis, closely associated with the Aphrodite legend. This goddess, the Astarte (q.v.) of the Phenicians, had her famous temple near the source of the river, which issues from a cavern under the steep high wall of the Jabal al-Munaiṭirah. The ruins of the fane, 90 feet long and fifty-five feet wide, may still be seen, and probably represent the temple of Venus of Aphaka, destroyed by Constantine the Great in the fourth century. The modern village of Afḳa is situated fifteen minutes above the source. Near the village of al-Ghinah, on the southern bank of the river, sculptures were found by Renan representing the leaping goddess and the death of Adonis. The center of the Adonis cult, the Byblos of the Greeks and the Gebal of the Phenicians, the modern Jabail with about a thousand inhabitants, lies an hour and a half north of the mouth of the Nahr Ibrahim (see GEBAL). The rocky road along the coast leads to the town of Batrun, the ancient Botrys. North of the Nahr al-Jauz rises a broad promontory now called al-Shakkai, but called by the Greeks "face of God," apparently translating its Phenician name (cf. Gen. xxxii. 30; I Kings xii. 25).

7. Beirut to al-Shakkai.

At al-Shakkai central Phenicia ends. The road along the coast now crosses some small promontories, and then enters the plain of Tripolis, which spreads out at the mouth of the Nahr abu 'Ali, or the Nahr Ḳadisha. The modern Tripolis consists of the court of al-Mina on the northern edge of a low but rocky promontory, with a series of small islands enclosing the harbor, and the city proper, now called Ṭarabulus. The latter is situated on both banks of the Nahr abu 'Ali, about two miles from al-Mina. It owes its existence to the Mohammedans, who destroyed the former city on the coast in 1289. The city of the Phenicians and the crusaders, which probably occupied the site of the present al-Mina, had three distinct quarters occupied by Tyrians, Sidonians, and Aradians respectively. Before the Persian period, however, the city is not mentioned, its origin being obscure. From Ṭarabulus the coast bends westward, the resulting bay being called Jun 'Akkar. The coast is less rugged, especially where the Nahr al-Kabir or Nahr Laftara (the Eleutherus of the Grecks) approaches the sea. Through the broad plain thus formed the road leads to Emesa and

8. Tripolis and Environs.

Hamath in the valley of the Orontes. Between Tripolis and the Nahr al-Kabir a number of ancient cities were located. On the southern bank of the Nahr al-Barid was Orthosia, the Arab Artusiah or Artusi; and on the north bank of the Nahr 'Arḳa was Arka or Arke, the Roman Cæsarea Libani, where Alexander Severus was born (now called Tell 'Arḳa). The site is also brought into connection with the Canaanitic Arkites (Gen. x. 17). Scarcely half a mile north of the Nahr 'Arḳa a village Syn existed in the fifteenth century, and this has been connected with the Sinites of Gen. x. 17; cuneiform inscriptions mention a site Sianu near Ẓimira and 'Arẓa. North of the Nahr al-Kabir rises the Jabal al-Anzariyah, receiving its name from the Shi'ite sect of the Nuẓairi, who live chiefly on this mountain.

9. Extreme Northern Phenicia.

The coast of northern Phenicia is, in general, milder and more attractive than in the southern and central portions, so that its cities were numerous. The first is Simyra or Simyrus, the Ẓumur of the Amarna letters, probably to be identified with the modern Ẓumrah between the Nahr al-Kabir and the Nahr al-Abrash. Two or three hours later the district of the ancient Aradians is reached, where, between the Nahr al-Ḳiblah and the Nahr Amrit, are extensive remains of the city of Marat, the Marathus of the Greeks, important during the Persian period, but destroyed in the struggles following the downfall of the Seleucids. On the coast, an hour farther north, is Ṭarṭus, the medieval Tortosa and the ancient Antaradus, first mentioned by Ptolemy in the second century A.D. The Phenician center on this part of the coast was the island city of Aradus (the Arvad of Ezek. xxvii. 8, 11, the modern Ru'ad or Arwad), situated between Amrit and Ṭarṭus on an irregular rock some 800 yards long by 500 wide. Of the ancient city little remains. The present inhabitants, between 2,000 and 3,000 in number, are expert boatmen (cf. Ezek. xxvii. 8). Arvad is mentioned as a Phenician city about 1500 B.C., and on its ships Tiglath-Pileser sailed the Mediterranean. Later it is repeatedly mentioned in Assyrian inscriptions as a place "in the midst of the sea." The nearest port on the mainland was Carne or Carnus, the modern Ḳarnun, an hour north of Ṭarṭus, where ruins of fortifications are still visible. Other harbors reckoned to Arvad were Balanias or Leucas (the modern Baniyas), Paltus (the modern Baldah), and Gabala (the modern Jablah). Probably the population of this northern district was not exclusively Phenician, and Phenicians hardly had centers beyond it. North of the promontory of Ras ibn Hani was a Heraclea, the name of which suggests Phenician origin; and the city of Rhosus (the modern Arsuz) north of the Ras al-Khanzir, and the city of Myriandrus (Myriandus) are expressly said to have been in the hands of the Phenicians. The latter place was the predecessor of the modern Alexandretta or Iskandarun, but probably lay somewhat farther to the south.

II. Names and Ethnology: The name Phenicia is derived from the Greek, occurring as early as Homer (*Odyssey*, xiv. 288, xv. 419) and Herodotus (i. 1–8, etc.). From this is derived the name of the country, Phenice (*Odyssey*, iv. 83, xiv. 291; Herodotus, ii. 44 sqq.), the form Phenicia being later. The meaning is uncertain. In the twelfth century Eustathius of Thessalonica, with probable correctness, advanced the view that it denoted "red," and referred to the color of the people. Movers derived Phenice from the Greek *phoinix*, "date palm," but this tree is seldom found in Phenicia, and is of inferior quality there. Nor is there any reason to suppose that the name of the country is derived from the Egyptian Fenkhu; about 1500 B.C. the Egyptians termed the Phenician coast from Acre to Arvad Zahi or Zahe. The Babylonians reckoned Phenicia in the land of Amurru; and after Tiglath-Pileser III. Syria and Palestine were also called the "land of the Hittites." A special name for Phenicia does not occur. Late Greek writers state that the Phenicians named themselves Canaanites (see CANAAN). The Phenicians seem to have called themselves after the names of their cities, Tyrians, Sidonians, etc. In the Old Testament, therefore, the name "Sidon" (Zidon) and "Sidonians," when not shown by the context to refer expressly to the city and its inhabitants (as in Gen. x. 19; Judges i. 31; II Sam. xxiv. 6; I Kings xvii. 9 [cf. Luke iv. 26]; Isa. xxiii. 2, 4, 12; Ezek. xxviii. 21–22), must be understood to connote Phenicia and the Phenicians in general (e.g., Deut. xiii. 9; Josh. xiii. 4, 6; Judges iii. 3; I Kings v. 6; Ezek. xxxii. 30). This linguistic usage, found current and continued by the Israelites, implies that Sidon was then the most important city of Phenicia. Later this usage disappeared, so that Herodotus ("History," i. 1) uses "Phenicians" to denote the population of the country. In later passages of the Old Testament (as Jer. xxv. 22; Joel iv. 4; Zech. ix. 2; I Macc. v. 15), as well as in the New Testament (Matt. xi. 21–22; Mark iii. 8; Luke vi. 17; Acts xii. 20), the formal phrase "Tyre and Sidon" denotes the Phenicians in general.

1. Names.

2. Ethnology.

The inhabitants of the Phenician coast can not be separated from the pre-Israelitic population of Canaan. This is shown, in the first place, by community of language as evinced in inscriptions, proper names, individual words cited by classic writers, and the sentences placed in the mouth of the Carthaginian Hanno in the *Poenulus* of Plautus, which show that the Phenician language was essentially identical with Hebrew. Though this linguistic affinity does not prove ethnological unity, the absence of opposing data renders it probable. In view of the natural contour of Canaan it would seem that the coast was settled from the southern mountain-district northward. The problem whether the Phenicians were indigenous in Syria is a part of the broader question of the original home of the pre-Israelitic population of Canaan. The most plausible answer seems to be that given by Herodotus (i. 1, vii. 80), who affirms that the Phenicians formerly dwelt by the Red Sea, whence they journeyed across Syria to the Mediterranean, thus implying an original home in Arabia and conforming with the general trend of Semitic migrations. Winckler (*Geschichte Israels*, i. 126–132, Leipsic,

1895) has advanced the hypothesis that the Phenician and Canaanitic migration was the second to take place from Arabia, probably between 2800 and 1600 B.C. While there are thus no ethnological or linguistic reasons for regarding the Phenicians as a separate people, the events of history render it possible to speak of them as a nation. In their home, between the open sea and the almost impassable mountains, they became navigators and merchants, rather than an agricultural or pastoral people. Thus, on the one hand, their coherence with the Canaanites became ever more loose; and, on the other hand, their commercial interests developed a fresh bond of union. In Syria they never unfolded a strict nationality, for there was always a number of central points, consisting of the larger cities. The Phenicians accordingly called themselves Sidonians, Giblites, Carthaginians, and the like. To foreigners, however, they all seemed to be of one type, bold seamen, cunning and conscienceless traders. Through their enterprise and good fortune they brought the treasures of Babylonia and Egypt to the west, and thus essentially furthered the subsequent civilization of the Mediterranean lands.

III. Religion: The sources for a knowledge of Phenician religion and cult are scanty. The inscriptions contain little but names of gods whose pronunciation is often uncertain, and many formulas the meaning of which is obscure. The euhemeristic treatise on the cosmogony and theogony of the Phenicians, the "Phenician history" of Sanchuniathon (q.v.), can be used only with caution, if at all, for the older period. It is remarkable that in so maritime a people the cult of sea-gods was so slightly emphasized. Hesychius mentions a "Zeus of the sea," and at Beirut the eight Kabirs ("great ones, mighty ones") were held to be the discoverers and patrons of navigation. The fact that in the names of the gods thus far known no allusions to trade or navigation appear seems to imply that the Phenicians developed their religion not on the coast or as seafarers, but in another region where their life was not unlike that of the other Canaanites to whom they were akin.

1. Deities.

The Phenician divinities were primarily local gods. Besides the gods of the cities, there were gods of the mountains. As possessors they were called *ba'al;* as lords, *adon;* as rulers, *melekh* (see MOLOCH, MOLECH). Their worshipers were *gerim*, "protegés," or *'abhadhim*, "servants." Sexual antitheses were prominent in their religious system. The divinities were usually named after the place where they were honored: *Ba'al Ṣor*, the god of Tyre; *Ba'al Ṣidon*, the god of Sidon; *Ba'alath Gebal*, the goddess of Byblus. When the Phenicians founded a new colony, they established there a new seat for the cult of their native gods, whose authority did not transcend the limits of the new settlement. In common parlance the Phenicians spoke of a *ba'al* or *ba'alath* without any qualifying phrase (cf. I Kings xviii. 19 sqq.), but there was no divinity so named. The feminine form *ba'alath* was relatively rare, its place being taken by *'ashtart*, so that Astarte, or Ashtoreth, appears in the Old Testament as the goddess *par excellence* of the Sidonians (i.e., Phenicians; cf. I Kings xi. 5, 33, xxiii. 13; see ASTARTE; ASHERA; BAAL). Few Phenician gods are known by specific names. The one most frequently mentioned was Melkarth (Hercules), the "King of the City (of Tyre)." Eshmun, greatly honored in Sidon, and compared with Æsculapius, seems to have been a god of health and healing. Proper names often contain the divine names Ṣd ("Hunter, Fisher"[?]; possibly connected with the name Sidon), Skn, Pmy, and P'm, as well as a goddess Tnt (usually pronounced Tanith). Among the foreign gods were the Egyptian Isis, Osiris, Horus, Bast, and Thoth; the Syrian Resheph and 'Anat; and the Babylonian Tammuz, Hadad, and Dagon. The Phenicians, like the Canaanites, were accustomed to place by the altars sacred stones as the abode of the deity, pillars being substituted later for natural stones. Such pillars were called *maṣṣeba, naṣib,* or *ḥammanim* (see MEMORIALS AND SACRED STONES), and were regarded as animate. In the cult of female divinities, the sacred stone was replaced by the sacred post (representing the sacred tree), called Asherah (q.v.). The two pillars in the temple of Melkarth at Tyre (Herodotus, ii. 44; Josephus, *Apion*, i. 18) doubtless connoted the dualism found in nature. Still other sacred sites had groups of three pillars, apparently typifying a threefold phenomenon of nature.

2. Cult.

The narrow local cults were later transcended by the widely worshiped *Ba'al Shamem*, or "Lord of Heaven," with his "goddess of the heaven of Baal" (cf. Herodotus, i. 105), who may be compared with the "queen of heaven" of Jer. vii. 18, and with the Carthaginian Cælestis. The signification of the divinity El is uncertain. He seems to have been first honored in Byblus, and was equated with Kronos by the Greeks, who said that he was worshiped with sacrifices of children in Phenicia, Carthage, and Sardinia (see MOLOCH, MOLECH). An important list of Carthaginian divinities is given in the deities invoked by Hannibal to witness his treaty with Philip of Macedon (Polybius, vii. 9). In Phenician cult there was nothing to distinguish them from other Canaanites. Sacred enclosures with altars, stones, and trees (posts), a cell or larger house for the image of the divinity (the architecture strongly influenced by Egypt), the firstlings of all productions for the deity, animal sacrifices, sacred dances, "votaries," priests, ablutions, and circumcision—all were present. The cosmogony presupposed a tripartite division into heaven, earth, and sea.

IV. History: The earliest mention of the Phenician coast thus far known refers to its conquest by Sargon, king of Agade, in the middle of the third millennium B.C. Whether, however, this means the Phenicians proper is a problem, and Winckler holds that the campaign was waged against the pre-Phenician inhabitants, whose commercial activity and culture were later adopted by the Phenicians from the Arabian desert. About 1400 B.C. the Egyptian power, to which Thothmes III. had subjected the Phenicians a century previous, was waning, the Hittites were entering the

1. Till the Assyrian Period.

country and the kings of the Amorites, Abdashirtu and Aziru, were attacking the Phenician cities, whose kings wrote in vain to Egypt for aid. Sethos I. and Rameses II. restored the Egyptian power, at least for the southern portion of Syria; but the supremacy of the Pharaohs came to an end, and the Philistines definitely settled in the land. The first prosperity of the Phenician cities began about 1000 B.C. Tyre became predominant, the supremacy of Sidon apparently being religious and civilizing rather than political. Hiram I. of Tyre, after receiving a gift of twenty Israelitic cities from Solomon, engaged in trade with him (see OPHIR; TARSHISH) and founded the colony of Citium in Cyprus, naming the town Ḳarta Ḥadasht, or "new city" (Carthage). Under King Pygmalion the famous colony of Carthage is said to have been founded from Tyre, when what was probably an existing city received a new lord, a new cult, and a new name. Winckler holds that the impulse to migration which led the Phenicians to Canaan sent other emigrants from Arabia along the northern coast of Africa, and possibly into southern Europe, so that the "foundation" of Carthage was, in reality, merely its subjugation by Tyre. However this may be, the subordination of Carthage to Tyre led to the supremacy in the western Mediterranean of Tyre, which seems to have extended its sway over a number of Syrian cities also. While Hiram I. is always termed "king of Tyre" (II Sam. v. 11; I Kings v. 15, ix. 10), Ethbaal is called "king of the Zidonians" (I Kings xvi. 31), thus implying that Tyre and Sidon had meanwhile been united under the hegemony of the former. This is confirmed by the statement of Menander (cited by Josephus, *Ant.*, VIII., xiii. 2) that Ethbaal founded Botrys (and also Auza in Lybia). The northern cities around Aradus, however, were unaffected by this predominance of Tyre.

The invasions of the Assyrian kings Asshurbanipal and Shalmaneser II. in the ninth century were averted by the payment of tribute; but in 738 Tiglath-Pileser III. formed the Assyrian province of Simyra from the cities in the Eleutherus valley. Sennacherib vainly besieged Tyre five years (701–696), though it lost its possessions on the mainland, while Sidon became tributary and received a new king from Sennacherib. Later Sidon revolted against Esarhaddon, only to be destroyed in 675 and replaced by an Assyrian city. Later still, Tyre was attacked and, with Aradus, forced to make peace with the Assyrians. The decline of the Assyrian power was probably favorable to the Phenician cities, and Egyptian attempts to regain supremacy were unsuccessful. The Egyptians were driven from Syria by the Babylonians under Nebuchadrezzar II., who beleaguered Tyre in vain (585–573). But internal strife broke out in Tyre, and after rule by suffetes, or "judges," the city was forced to ask Babylon for a king. Under Persian rule, which was accepted unresistingly by the Phenicians, Sidon became predominant. In the days of Herodotus, Sidon, Tyre, and Aradus made the "Three Cities" (Tripolis), but in the reign of Alexander the Great the chief Phenician centers were Tyre, Sidon, Byblus, and Aradus. In the Persian period, Aradus extended its power along the coast farther than before; in the south Acre, Ashdod, Ashkelon, and Carmel belonged to Tyre; Dor and Joppa to Sidon; and the entire coast to the fifth Persian satrapy. With the connivance of Nectanebo of Egypt, the Phenician cities, under Tennes of Sidon, revolted against Persia in 350, but were ruthlessly suppressed by Artaxerxes III. Alexander the Great found resistance only at Tyre, which he succeeded in reducing (see above). On the emergence of the Ptolemies and Seleucids from the confusion ensuing on the death of Alexander the Great, the Phenician cities came under Seleucus I. His successors also held Aradus and its vicinity, while the cities south of the Eleutherus were under the Ptolemies from 281 to 198. The kings of Sidon in the third century seem to have included Eshmunazar I., Tabnit, and Eshmunazar II., but on the death of the last-named Sidon apparently adopted a republican form of government, as Tyre did in 274. The other Phenician cities secured autonomy from the Seleucids, and these privileges were generally confirmed by the Romans. The Phenician language, however, was superseded by Aramaic, while the higher classes prided themselves on Greek or Roman culture.

2. Assyrian to the Roman Period.

Phenician trade was carried on both by land and sea. Land traffic brought the products and treasures of Arabia, Babylonia, and Armenia, and later of Persia and India, to the Mediterranean. Commerce with Egypt was probably carried on chiefly by water, though the maritime commerce of Phenicia was scarcely as extensive as is commonly supposed. Colonies proper were to be found only in Cyprus and northern Africa, Gades in southern Spain probably being settled originally from Africa. The Phenician commercial settlements or factories along the shores of the Mediterranean do not deserve the name of colonies.

3. Trade and Discovery.

The Phenicians were primarily merchants, ever eager to adorn their markets with the best and newest (cf. Ezek. xxvii.). Such a people would not be likely to develop an individual art, and Phenician remains, dating at the earliest from the Persian period, show a mixture of Egyptian, Babylonian, Persian, and Greek elements. The Phenician coins were struck on Greek models, but in Aradus Persian weights were used, and Phenician in Byblus, Sidon, and Tyre. In architecture the Phenicians received their inspiration from the Egyptians, but they developed a marked individuality in the treatment of stone. The Phenicians were skilled in constructing aqueducts, as is shown by the stone pipes through which the island of Tyre was supplied with water. Their ability in building ships was famed in antiquity (cf. Ezek. xxvii.; Herodotus, vii. 96, 128). Their moral reputation, however, was indifferent, as the allusions of the Odyssey to their knavery amply prove. The Phenicians have won much unmerited fame as discoverers through the attribution to them by the Greeks of the invention of things which they merely transmitted. In Rome purple fabrics were called *sarranus* (from Sarra, "Tyre"), and the Tyrians are described as the best skilled in dyeing in

purple. The art, however, was perhaps Babylonian. In like manner the Greeks thought that the alphabet originated in Tyre, especially in view of the power of the city about 1000 B.C. As a matter of fact Phenicia merely transmitted the alphabet, which probably originated in Babylonia like the cuneiform writing. And finally it may be noted that glass and faience, the invention of which was popularly ascribed to the Phenicians, were known in Egypt earlier than in Phenicia. (H. GUTHE.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The articles in the dictionaries are general, covering the whole topic. The best are: *DB*, iii. 683–685, 855–862, 823–825, 980–981; *EB*, iii. 3730–65; *JE*, ix. 667–670; Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire*, part xxxi. 228–247; Jacobus, *Dictionary*, pp. 674–676.

On the geography consult: V. Guérin, *Description de la Palestine*, III., *Galilee*, part 2, Paris, 1880; *Survey of Western Palestine, Memoirs*, vol. i., *Galilee*, London, 1881; G. Ebers and H. Guthe, *Palästina in Bild und Wort*, vol. ii., Stuttgart, 1884.

On the art, language, and inscriptions: Inscriptions are collected in the *CIS*, part 1, vols., i.–ii., Paris, 1881–89. Consult: G. Perrot and C. Chipiez, *Histoire de l'art dans l'antiquité*, vol. 3, *Phénicie*, Paris, 1885, Eng. transl., *Hist. of Art in Phœnicia*, 2 vols., London, 1885; W. Gesenius, *Scripturæ linguæque Phœniciæ monumenta*, Leipsic, 1857; P. Schröder, *Die phönizische Sprache*, Halle, 1869 (grammar); B. Stade, *Morgenländische Forschungen*, pp. 167 sqq., Leipsic, 1875; C. Clermont-Ganneau, *Sceaux et cachets phéniciens*, Paris, 1883; E. Ledrain, *Notice des monuments phéniciens* (i.e., in the Louvre), Paris, 1888; A. Bloch, *Phönicische's Glossar*, Berlin, 1890; J. G. E. Hoffmann, *Ueber einige phönikische Inschriften*, Göttingen, 1890; A. Pellegrini, *Studii d'Epigrafia fenicia*, Palermo, 1891; O. Hamdi, *Une Nécropole royale à Sidon*, Paris, 1892–96; M. Lidzharski, *Handbuch der nordsemitischen Epigraphik*, Weimar, 1898; idem, *Ephemeris für semitische Epigraphik*, Giessen, 1900 sqq.; A. Mayr, *Aus den phönizischen Nekropolen von Malta*, Munich, 1905; Schrader, *KAT*, pp. 126 sqq., et passim; W. F. von Landau, *Die phönizischen Inschriften*, Leipsic, 1907.

On the alphabet: E. de Rougé, *Mémoires sur l'origine égyptienne de l'alphabet phénicien*, Paris, 1874; Deecke, in *ZDMG*, xxxi (1877), 102 sqq.; P. Berger, *Hist. de l'écriture dans l'antiquité*, Paris, 1892; Ball, in *PSBA*, 1893, pp. 392–408; C. R. Conder, *Bible and the East*, pp. 74 sqq., Edinburgh, 1896; H. Zimmern, in *ZDMG*, l (1896), 667 sqq.; J. Alvarez de Peralta, *Iconografia de los Alfabetos fenicio y hebraico*, Madrid, 1898.

On the history: R. Pietschmann, *Geschichte der Phönizier*, Berlin, 1889; G. Rawlinson, *Hist. of Phœnicia*, London, 1889; idem, *Phœnicia*, ib. 1889; F. C. Movers, *Die Phönizier*, Bonn, 1841–56; J. Kenrick, *Hist. of Phœnicia*, London, 1855; E. Renan, *Mission de Phénicie*, Paris, 1864; G. Maspero, *Hist. ancienne des peuples de l'orient*, Paris, 1875; idem, *Struggle of the Nations*, London, 1896; H. Prutz, *Aus Phönizien*, Leipsic, 1876; F. Bovet, *Egypt, Palestine, and Phœnicia*, London, 1882; E. Oberhummer, *Phönizier in Akarnanien*, Munich, 1882; E. Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums*, vol. i., Stuttgart, 1884; A. von Gutschmid, in *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Germ. trans., in his *Kleine Schriften*, ii. 36–80, Leipsic, 1889; W. M. Müller, *Asien und Europa*, Leipsic, 1893; C. Peters, *Das goldene Ophir Salomo's. Eine Studie zur Geschichte der phönikischen Weltpolitik*, Munich, 1895; H. Winckler, *Altorientalische Forschungen*, i. 5 (1897), 421 sqq., ii. 1 (1898), 65–70, ii. 2 (1899), 295 sqq.; idem, *Geschichte Israels*, i. 104 sqq., Leipsic, 1895; W. von Landau, *Die Phönizier*, Leipsic, 1901; idem, *Die Bedeutung der Phönizier im Völkerleben*, ib. 1905; V. Bérard, *Les Phéniciens et l'Odyssée*, 2 vols., Paris, 1902–03; idem, in *RHR*, xxxix. 173–228, 419–460; C. A. Bruston, *Études phéniciennes*, Paris, 1903; W. M. Müller, *Neue Darstellungen "mykenischer" Gesandter und phönizischer Schiffe in altägyptischen Wandgemälden*, Berlin, 1904; A. D. Mordtmann, *Historische Bilder vom Bosporus*, part 2, Constantinople, 1907; F. C. Eiselen, *Sidon: a Study in Oriental History*, New York, 1907.

On the religion: C. and T. Muller, *Fragmenta historicum Græcorum*, iii. 560 sqq., 4 vols., Paris, 1841–51; W. von Baudissin, *Studien zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte*, Leipsic, 1878; F. Baethgen, *Beiträge zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte*, Berlin, 1888; P. D. Chantepie de la Saussaye, *Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte*, i. 348–383, Tübingen, 1905; Smith, *Rel. of Sem.* Consult also the article SANCHUNIATHON and the literature given there.

PHILADELPHA. See ASIA MINOR, IV

PHILADELPHIAN SOCIETY. See LEAD, JANE.

PHILANTHROPY. See SOCIAL SERVICE OF THE CHURCH.

PHILARET, fĭ"lā-ret' (VASILY MIKHAILOVICH DROZDOV): Russian prelate; b. at Kolomna (58 m. s.s.e. of Moscow) 1782; d. at Moscow Dec. 1, 1867. He was educated at the seminaries of Kolomna and St. Sergius Lavra, and on the completion of his studies was at once appointed professor in the latter. He became preacher at the monastery of St. Sergius at Troitsk in 1806, and four years later was appointed professor of theology in the ecclesiastical academy of Alexander Nevski in St. Petersburg, becoming archimandrite in 1811 and director in 1812. He took monastic vows in 1817, and after being bishop of Reval and episcopal vicar of St. Petersburg, became, in 1819, archbishop of Tver and a member of the Holy Synod. In the following year he was archbishop of Yaroslav, and in 1821 was translated to Moscow, also becoming metropolitan in 1826. His daring utterances, however, brought him into imperial disfavor, and from 1845 until the accession of Alexander II. in 1855 he was restricted to the limits of his diocese. He is said to have prepared Alexander's proclamation freeing the serfs (Mar. 19, 1861), and he enjoyed the reputation of being one of the leading pulpit orators of his time and country. He was a prominent figure in preparing a Russian translation of the Bible (see BIBLE VERSIONS, B, XVI., § 2), and wrote "Colloquy between a Believer and a Skeptic on the True Doctrine of the Greco-Russian Church" (St. Petersburg, 1815); "Compend of Sacred History" (1816); "Commentary on Genesis" (1816); "Attempt to Explain Psalm lxvii." (1818); "Sermons delivered at Various Times" (1820); "Extracts from the Four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles for Use in Lay Schools" (1820); "Christian Catechism" (1823; Eng. transl. by R. W. Blackmore in his *Doctrine of the Russian Church*, Aberdeen, 1845; reprinted in Schaff, *Creeds*, ii. 445–542); "Extracts from the Historical Books of the Old Testament" (1828–30); "Principles of Religious Instruction" (1828); and "New Collection of Sermons" (1830–36). An English version of some of his sermons was published at London in 1873 under the title "Select Sermons by the late Metropolitan of Moscow, Philaret," together with a brief biographical sketch.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *Biographie universelle*, xxxiii. 45–46; *La Grande Encyclopedie*, xxvi. 645.

PHILASTER, fi-las'ter (PHILASTRIUS): Bishop of Brescia and ecclesiastical writer; b. possibly in Egypt in the first half of the fourth century; d. before 397. He had been consecrated before 381, for in that year he took part in the Synod of Aquileia. Augustine knew him while at Milan; and his successor Gaudentius, who became bishop of Bres-

cia before 397, praised his orthodoxy and learning (*MPL*, xx. 957). According to the tradition current at Brescia, he died on July 18; but the *Sermo de vita et obitu Philastri* (*MPL*, xx. 1002), ascribed to Gaudentius, seems to date rather from the eighth or ninth century. About 383 Philaster wrote his *Diversarum hæreseōn liber* (ed. J. Sichard, Basel, 1528; also in *MPL*, xii.; *CSEL*, xxxviii.), a catalogue containing twenty-eight pre-Christian and 128 Christian heresies. The style shows lack of education, and the matter lack of intellectual training. It is fanciful and artificial, especially in its divisions of distinction. His source for heresies previous to Noetus was probably the lost *Syntagma adversus omnes hæreses* of Hippolytus, and for the Manicheans the *Acta Archelai*. The intrinsic value of the work is small. He was, however, cited by Augustine, and thus gained importance in the Middle Ages, and he is of some interest in tracing the history of the New-Testament canon, especially for the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Letter to the Laodiceans. (R. Schmid.)

Bibliography: R. A. Lipsius, *Zur Quellenkritik des Epiphanios*, Vienna, 1865; idem, *Die Quellen der ältesten Ketzergeschichte*, Leipsic, 1875; A. Harnack, *Quellenkritik der Geschichte des Gnosticismus*, Leipsic, 1874; idem, *Litteratur*, i. 150; J. Kunze, *De historiæ gnosticismi fontibus*, Leipsic, 1894; Krüger, *History*, passim; Schaff, *Christian Church*, iii. 931; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, v. 171–178, viii. 42–43; *DCB*, iv. 351–353.

PHILEAS, fi-lê'as: Bishop of Thmuis (the modern Tmai, between the Tanite and Mendesian branches of the Nile) and martyr; d. at Alexandria 305. According to Eusebius, he was distinguished for his wealth, noble birth, honorable rank, and philosophical training, and the same church historian also gives a fragment of a letter written by Phileas from his prison in Alexandria to his diocese at Thmuis (*Hist. eccl.*, VIII., x. 2–10; Eng. transl., *NPNF*, 1 ser., i. 330–331), holding up the example of the Alexandrian martyrs. Together with three other bishops imprisoned with him, Phileas wrote to Meletius of Lycopolis (q.v.), charging him with violating the rules of the Church by appointing other bishops in their places. The acts of Phileas, which are extant both in Greek and Latin, seem to have been known to Eusebius and to Jerome; and Rufinus (*Hist. eccl.*, viii. 10) states that they were written by a Christian named Gregorius. The official who presided at the martyrdom of Phileas was Culcianus, who was succeeded by Hierocles apparently in 306, and at latest by 308.

(N. Bonwetsch.)

Bibliography: The letter is also in M. J. Routh, *Reliquiæ sacræ*, 5 vols., Oxford, 1846–48; Eng. transl. with introduction and notes is in *ANF*, vi. 161–164. The Acts of his Martyrdom are in *ASB*, Feb., i. 459 sqq. (with commentary); R. Knopff, *Ausgewählte Märtyrakten*, pp. 102 sqq., Freiburg, 1901; F. Combefis, *Illustrium Christi martyrum lecti triumphi*, pp. 145 sqq., Paris, 1660 (the Greek text). The older literature is given in *ANF*, Bibliography, p. 71. Consult: Jerome, *De vir. ill.*, lxxviii.; N. Lardner, *Credibility of Gospel History*, in *Works*, iii. 234–237, London, 1838; J. M. Neale, *Hist. of the Holy Eastern Church*, i. 97, 99–101, London, 1847; E. le Blaut, *Les Persécuteurs et les martyrs aux premiers siècles*, pp. 226–227, Paris, 1893; Harnack, *Litteratur*, i. 441–442, ii. 2, pp. 69–72, 74, 83; C. Schmidt, in *TU*, v. 4b (1901); O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Litteratur*, ii. 211–212, Freiburg, 1903; Krüger, *History*, p. 219; *DCB*, iv. 353; *KL*, ix. 1998.

PHILEMON, EPISTLE TO. See Paul the Apostle, II.

PHILIP II.: King of Spain, son of the Emperor Charles V and Isabella of Portugal; b. at Valladolid May 21, 1527; d. at Madrid Sept. 13, 1598. Educated under Dominican rather than Jesuit influence, he perpetuated the Spanish idea of Roman Catholicism that underlay the policy of Ferdinand and Isabella and Cardinal Ximenes, which regarded Roman Catholicism as the only tolerable form of Christianity and as absolutely essential to the political power of Spain. He had no sympathy with the humanistic popes and Curia, and would brook no interference of the papacy with Spanish administration; on the other hand, he insisted upon controlling papal policy. The policy of compromise by which Charles V had sought to reunify religion throughout his realm had been recognized by himself as ineffective.

Two Chief Aims; Failure in England.

Philip began his reign with the fixed resolve to exterminate Protestantism at whatever cost from every foot of territory that he controlled. Closely connected with this aspect of his policy was a determination to make his own will supreme throughout his vast realm. Protestantism had never been allowed to gain much headway in Spain and he spared no effort or expense to remove every vestige of anti-catholicism. With equal severity he dealt with the Moriscoes (professed Moorish converts still Mohammedan at heart) and with converts from Judaism whose sincere devotion to Roman Catholicism was suspected. He married Mary of England (1554) with the twofold object of bringing England under the domination of Spain and of exterminating heresy in the British Isles. He even sought to ingratiate himself with the English people by putting aside his customary moroseness and reserve and assuming an air of friendliness and suavity. His failure to win the hearts of the English, Mary's dissatisfaction with his private life, and the urgent need of his presence at home led to his leaving England forever (Sept., 1555). In 1556 by the abdication of Charles V. he became master of Spain, the Sicilies, the Milanese territory, Franche Comté, the Netherlands, Mexico, and Peru, thus becoming the greatest potentate on earth with seemingly unlimited resources.

His Wars.

He was impatient to begin a crusade against Protestantism in which he sought to enlist all the Roman Catholic sovereigns of Europe, but was shocked by the discovery that the pope had formed an alliance with the king of France and the sultan to deprive him of his Italian possessions. He scrupled at going to war with the pope, but self-interest soon triumphed and he sent the duke of Alva to drive French and papal forces from Sicily and to seize the papal possessions, while he himself administered a severe chastisement to the French at St. Quentin (Aug. 10, 1557) and at Gravelines (Apr. 2, 1559). After the death of Mary of England he sought once more to gain a foothold in England by proposing to marry Elizabeth, her sister and successor. Failing in this project he married Isabella

of France, daughter of Catharine de Medici, his main object being to bring his influence in favor of Roman Catholicism more powerfully to bear upon France for the destruction of the Huguenots and to prevent French interference with his measures against Evangelical Christianity in the Netherlands. As a preparation for the crusade against Protestantism, which he foresaw to be an undertaking of vast proportions, he began to gather rapidly into the treasury the wealth of his domain, ignoring completely the customary and legal rights of the people. The revolt of the Netherlands and his unsuccessful efforts to suppress it depleted the well-filled treasury and led to extortionate and destructive taxation in Spain, including ecclesiastical foundations. Portugal became his through failure of the direct male line of succession and through a successful military invasion (1580). The pope having bestowed England upon Philip, he undertook to take possession (1588) by sending the armada, a fleet of 131 vessels with 19,000 marines and 8,000 sailors, against a far inferior English fleet. Favoring winds and superior seamanship gave the victory to the English, and Spain was well-nigh swept off the sea. Philip promoted and rejoiced in the massacre of St. Bartholomew's day in France (1572) and, when Henry of Navarre became heir apparent and was contending for the crown, Philip joined forces with the Guises. In the war that followed Philip was worsted and was obliged to sign the treaty of Vervins (May, 1598). By forty years of aggressive warfare, for the destruction of the political enemies of Spain and of the enemies of the Roman Catholic Church, he lost a large part of his hereditary possessions, impoverished and degraded what remained, and at his death (1598) left Spain a secondary power and its people far behind the age in free institutions and in civilization. The inquisition of heresy was with him a favorite occupation, and it was carried on with the utmost cruelty wherever his authority prevailed.

Attitude toward the Papacy.

While he regarded Roman Catholicism as the only valid form of Christianity and was convinced that the toleration of any other form of religion tended toward anarchy or at least toward destruction of monarchy, he was strenuous in resisting anything in papal or conciliar action that could be construed as infringement upon the prerogatives of the Spanish crown. His control of the Inquisition, his right to nominate bishops not only for Spain but also for the Netherlands, the *regium exequatur* (involving the right of the king to pass upon all papal bulls and briefs before their promulgation in his domains; see PLACET), the right of the king to administer and control the affairs of the Hospitalers and other endowed ecclesiastical institutions, he persistently maintained. He exercised a controlling influence over the Council of Trent (1556 onward) and his representatives were keen to detect and mighty to defeat any ordinance that trenched upon the rights of the Spanish crown. The conciliar provision for episcopal visitation of the chapters of the monastic orders he resolutely and effectively opposed, as well as the council's proposed arrangement for provincial and diocesan synods. He greatly promoted the progress of the monastic orders, especially the Dominicans, Franciscans, the order founded by St. Peter Nolasco (see NOLASCO), and Jesuits, and encouraged the multiplication of their establishments in Spain and the colonies. He took the keenest interest in papal elections and virtually insisted upon his right to nominate to the papal office or at least to defeat all candidates whom he disapproved. He promoted the Jesuit school at Douai for the education of Roman Catholic missionaries for England.

Apart from his single-minded devotion to the maintenance and extension of the authority of the Spanish crown and the universal prevalence of the Roman Catholic religion, Philip had few of the qualities that mark a great ruler or statesman. He was egoistic, unsympathetic, cruel (the loss of tens of thousands of troops seems to have affected him only as a diminution of the resources available for the accomplishment of his purposes, and he frequently was present in person at the burning of heretics), taciturn, morose, distrustful, and reserved.

A. H. NEWMAN.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A rich list of literature is furnished in the *British Museum Catalogue*. For English readers the best works directly on the subject are: W. H. Prescott, *Hist. of the Reign of Philip II.*, many editions, e.g., in his *Complete Works*, Boston, 1905 (a classic); M. A. S. Hume, *Philip II. of Spain*, London, 1897; idem, *Spain, its Greatness and Decay*, ib. 1898; idem, *Two English Queens and Philip*, ib. 1908. Further accounts of the life and reign of Philip are: C. Campana, 2 parts, Venice, 1605–09; G. Leti, 2 parts, Coligni, 1679; Robert Watson, 2 vols., London, 1808; A. Dumesnil, *Hist. de Philippe II.*, Paris, 1822; E. San Miguel y Valledor, 4 vols., Madrid, 1844–1847; F. A. M. Mignet, *Antonio Perez and Philip II.*, London, 1846; C. Gayarré, New York, 1866; R. Baumstark, Freiburg, 1875; V. Gomez, Madrid, 1879; H. Forneron, 4 vols., Paris, 1881–82; W. W. Norman, New York, 1898. Consult also more general works, such as: *Cambridge Modern History*, vol. iii., London and New York, 1905; S. A. Durham, *Hist. of Spain and Portugal*, 5 vols., London, 1832 (the best general history in English); M. W. Freer, *Elizabeth de Valois*, 2 vols., London, 1857; F. W. Schirrmacher, *Geschichte von Spanien*, 6 vols., Gotha, 1893; H. Watts, *Spain*, New York, 1893; C. A. Wilkens, *Spanish Protestants in the 16th Century*, New York, 1897; J. L. Motley, *The Rise of the Dutch Republic*, ed. Bell, London, 1904; H. C. Lea, *Hist. of the Inquisition of Spain*, 4 vols., New York, 1906–07; Robinson, *European History*, ii. 168 sqq. Illustrative original documents are cited in Reich, *Documents*, pp. 593 sqq., and in Gee and Hardy, *Documents*, pp. 384 sqq.

PHILIP IV. (LE BEL, "THE FAIR"): King of France (1285–1314), son of Philip III.; b. at Fontainebleau (37 m. s.s.e. of Paris) 1268; d. Nov. 29, 1314. A contemporary Flemish monkish chronicler, having in mind his persistent and unscrupulous efforts to subjugate Flanders, speaks of him as "a certain king of France eaten up by the fever of avarice and cupidity." Guizot, quoting with approval this medieval characterization, adds:

"And that was not the only fever inherent in Philip IV. . ; he was a prey also to that of ambition and, above all, to that of power. When he mounted the throne, at seventeen years of age, he was handsome, as his nickname tells us, cold, taciturn, harsh, and brave at need, but without fire or dash, able in the formation of his designs and obstinate in prosecuting them by craft or violence, bribery or cruelty, with wit to choose and support his servants, passionately vindictive against his enemies, and faithless and unsympathetic toward his subjects, but from time to time taking care to conciliate them either by calling them to his

aid in his difficulties or dangers, or by giving them protection against their opposers. Never, perhaps, was king better served by circumstances or more successful in his enterprises; but he had a scandalous contempt for rights, abused success, and thrust the kingship in France upon the high-road of that arrogant and reckless egotism which is sometimes compatible with ability and glory, but which carries with it in germ . . the native vices and fatal consequences of arbitrary and absolute power" (*Hist. of France*, i. 457, New York, 1884).

His political success was scarcely as real as this characterization implies; for while he was able to rob England of Guienne he was ultimately compelled to restore it, and while for a time he dominated and oppressed Flanders, his victory was followed by humiliating defeat. By his marriage to Johanna of Navarre (1284) he added Navarre, Champagne, and Brie to the royal possessions. Lyons was later (1312) subjected to the crown.

In ecclesiastical matters his success was more marked and permanent; but even when he contended most effectively against papal usurpations he manifested no higher qualities or motives than those set forth above. His refusal to yield to the demand of Boniface VIII. (q.v.) that he make peace with the king of England was due not to a clearly defined view of the proper relations of Church and State, but to his determination to have his own way and his willingness to defy what he must have recognized as the highest spiritual authority on earth. The same may be said of his successful retaliatory measures in response to Boniface's bull *Clericis laicos* (Feb. 25, 1296). He had gained so large a measure of authority in France that the French clergy, whether they sympathized with his defiance of the pope or not, dared not antagonize him, paid to the king the war subsidies demanded in spite of papal prohibition, and obeyed the king in withholding all papal dues. That Boniface deserved to be chastised for his arrogance does not make of Philip a heroic champion of civil liberty in administering the discipline. This is true also of his defiant treatment of the bull *Unam sanctam* (q.v.). His burning of this most arrogant papal pronouncement, his confiscation of the estates of prelates who sided with the pope, and his response to the pope's bull of excommunication by throwing the pope into prison, furnish no proof that he was a reformer. The fact is that he regarded neither God nor man when his own supposed interests were at stake. He manifested the same spirit in manipulating the college of cardinals so as to secure the election of a pope (Clement V.) committed to the interests of France and pledged to remove the papal capital to Avignon. He secured the removal of the papal seat to French territory not in order that he might bring about a reformation in the papal administration, but that he might prevent other sovereigns from using the organized power of the papacy against himself and might be assured of papal and curial cooperation for the aggrandizement of the French monarchy. He compelled the captive pope and Curia to cooperate with him in the destruction of the Templars (q.v.), not because he believed that the order had become scandalously immoral and blasphemously and diabolically irreligious, as members of the order were tortured into confessing, but because he was jealous of their political power and lack of subserviency, and covetous of their vast wealth. He persecuted the Jews not chiefly because he wanted them to become Christians, but as a means of appropriating their wealth. His avarice was also manifested in his debasing of the coinage of the realm. It is not to be supposed that the well conceived and well executed measures for consolidating and increasing the authority of the crown, overcoming civil and ecclesiastical opposition, and enriching the royal exchequer were the product of his own independent thinking. He was surrounded with able and unscrupulous counselors (such as William of Nogaret), who subserviently ministered to his consuming desire for power and glory and who profited personally by his successful exploitations. See Boniface VIII.; and Clement V.

A. H. Newman.

Bibliography: Important sources are: *Codex diplomaticus Flandriæ 1296–1325*, ed. T. de L. Stirum, Bruges, 1879 sqq.; and *Lettres inédites de Philippe le Bel*, Toulouse, 1887. Discussions, besides those in the church histories dealing with the period, are: A. Baillet, *Hist. des démêlez du Pape Boniface VIII. avec Philippe le Bel*, 2 parts, Paris, 1718; M. Bouquet, *Recueil des historiens des Gaules*, vol. xxi., 23 vols., ib. 1738–76; J. Jolly, *Philippe le Bel, ses desseins, ses actes, son influence*, ib. 1869; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, vol. vi.; Pastor, *Popes*, i. 57 sqq.; and the literature under Boniface VIII. and Clement V.

PHILIP THE APOSTLE: One of the twelve, usually named fifth in order in the lists of the apostles. Excepting in these lists, he is not mentioned in the Synoptic Gospels. In the narrative of the Fourth Gospel he occasionally appears individually (John i. 14 sqq., vi. 5 sqq., xii. 21 sqq., xiv. 8 sqq.). He "was of Bethsaida, the city of Andrew and Peter" (John i. 44), after whom, and probably owing to their common following of John the Baptist, Philip became acquainted with Jesus (John i. 14 sqq.), to whom he then brought Nathanael. According to John vi. 5–8, xii. 22 (cf. Mark iii. 18), he appears to have stood close to his fellow countryman Andrew; and John vi. 7, xii. 22, indicate that he possessed a reserved and circumspect disposition. But neither his Greek name nor John xii. 22 warrants the inference that Philip was of Greek education. On another side, to explain this whole Johannine portraiture of the Apostle Philip as purely ideal (e.g., Holtzmann) is opposed by the very simplicity of the data.

The patristic statements (Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.*, iii. 4; Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, III., xxxi., Eng. transl., *NPNF*, 1 ser., 162) that the unnamed disciple of Jesus in Luke ix. 60; Matt. viii. 22, was Philip rests probably on a confusion with the evangelist of this name. This mistake, however, has both possible and rational explanation, in case the apostle and the evangelist alike sojourned in Asia Minor (see Philip the Evangelist).

F. Sieffert.

Bibliography: Consult in general: The commentaries on the Gospels and Acts, and works on the apostolic age. Also A. B. Bruce, *The Training of the Twelve*, Edinburgh, 1871; J. B. Lightfoot, Commentary on Colossians, pp. 45–46, London, 1879; idem, *Cambridge Sermons*, pp. 129 sqq., ih. 1890; G. Milligan, *The Twelve Apostles*, London, 1904; *DB*, iii. 834–836; *EB*, iii. 3697–3701; *DCG*, ii. 359–360; Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire*, part xxxi., cols. 267–270. For the apocryphal history consult: C. Tischen-

dorf, *Acta apostolorum apocrypha*, pp. xxxi.-xl., 75–104, Leipsic, 1851; W. Wright, *Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles*, ii. 69 sqq., London, 1871; *Apocryphal Gospels, Acts, and Revelations*, Eng. transl. by A. Walker, pp. 301–324, Edinburgh, 1873; R. A. Lipsius, *Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und Apostellegenden*, ii. 2, pp. 1–53, Brunswick, 1884; *Analecta Bollandiana*, ix (1890), 204–249; T. Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, ii. 761–768, Leipsic, 1890; Stölten, in *JPT*, 1891, pp. 149–160; *Apocrypha Anecdota*, in *TU*, ii. 3 (1893); A. S. Lewis, *Mythological Acts of the Apostles*, in *Horæ Semiticæ*, iv., London, 1904; Harnack, *Litteratur*, i. 138.

PHILIP THE ARABIAN (MARCUS JULIUS PHILIPPUS ARABS): Roman emperor 244–249; b. at Bostra (119 m. s. of Damascus) in the Roman province of Arabia Petræa (whence his epithet of "the Arabian"); killed in battle near Verona, Italy, in the autumn of 249. Elevated to the purple by the murder of his predecessor, Gordianus III., he was able, during his reign, to subdue the Carpi who had ravaged Dacia, and, in 248, to celebrate the millennial of the founding of Rome, but was, on the other hand, obliged to conclude a humiliating peace with the Persians. In 249 Philip became involved in civil war with his rival Decius, by whom he was defeated and slain, his young son, whom he had made coregent at the age of seven, being murdered by the Pretorian Guard at Rome.

Philip the Arabian, whose high moral ideal is evinced by his earnest, though unavailing, efforts to suppress the practise of unnatural vice, is of interest theologically chiefly because of an ancient and wide-spread tradition which makes him the first Christian emperor of Rome. This tradition appears earliest in Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.*, vi. 34), who states that, according to report, Philip had desired to attend divine service on Easter, but had been obliged to perform penance. Vincent of Lerins (fifth century), Dionysius of Alexandria, Chrysostom, Jerome, the first Valesian Fragment, and Orosius likewise either explicitly state or at least imply that Philip was the first Christian emperor. It is plain, however, simply from the coins and medals struck by him that he was a worshiper of the Olympic gods and that he was himself *pontifex maximus*.

But though Philip was not a Christian, he was remarkably friendly to the new religion, and the tradition that he himself was an adherent of it was doubtless due, at least in part, to his tolerant attitude toward it. During his reign Origen could refute Celsus, and conversions could be made *en masse;* but he could not prevent Christians from falling victims to mob violence in Alexandria.

(Franz Görres.)

Bibliography: Sources are: Zosimus, *Hist.*, i. 17–22; Julius Capitolinus, *Gordiani tres*, chaps. xxii., xxvi.–xxx., ed. H. Peter, Leipsic, 1865; Sextus Aurelius Victor, *De Cæsaribus*, ed. J. F. Gruner, pp. 308–313, 429–430, Erlangen, 1787. Consult in general the history of the period in works on the Roman Empire, and in particular: B. Aubé, *Les Chrétiens dans l'empire romain*, pp. 467 sqq., Paris, 1881; P. Allard, *Hist. des persécutions*, ii. 215–256, 474–478, Paris, 1886; K. J. Neumann, *Der römische Staat und die allgemeine Kirche bis auf Diokletian*, i. 231–254, 330–331, Leipsic, 1890; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall*, chaps. vii., x., xvi.; *DCB*, iv. 355; *KL*, ix. 2008–09; Neander, *Christian Church*, vol. i., passim.

PHILIP THE EVANGELIST: One of the seven named in Acts vi. 5 as chosen to direct the care of the poor, to "serve tables," and possibly to direct outward concerns generally. Their office was probably different from the later diaconate (see Deacon), being, in any case, dissolved with the persecution and dispersion of the congregation (Acts viii.) and later supplanted by the more comprehensive office of presbyter (Acts xi. 30, xv. 29). Since that earlier office was instituted because the Grecian members of the primitive congregation complained that their widows were neglected, it may be assumed that at least a contingent of the seven was chosen from the Hellenist members themselves, and probably one of these was Philip. Philip, like Stephen (Acts vi. 13), took a comparatively liberal stand in relation to the Jewish law and worship, and evolved from that liberal mode of teaching its practical sequel, in that after his flight from Jerusalem he began an eventful missionary activity among the Samaritans (Acts viii. 5 sqq.), who were accounted nearly the same as heathen. Moreover, he baptized an uncircumcised half-proselyte, the queen of Ethiopia's eunuch (Acts viii. 26 sqq.). Next he journeyed, preaching the Gospel, "till he came to Cæsarea." Here Paul took up his abode with him, together with his fellow travelers, on Paul's final journey (Acts, xxi. 8). And as this incident is related in Acts, Philip is designated not only with reference to his former office as "one of the seven," but also with reference to his missionary activity as "the evangelist" and as the father of "four daughters, virgins, which did prophesy" (xxi. 9). This is the last notice of him in the New Testament.

The patristic tradition in regard to the subsequent fortunes of Philip is of impaired value for the reason that he has been confused with the apostle of like name, as in Polycrates of Ephesus, who reports of the Apostle Philip (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, III., xxxi. 3, V., xxiv. 2), that he rests in Hierapolis, as do two of his daughters, who grew old as virgins; whereas his third daughter, whose "walk and conversation were in the Spirit," lies buried in Ephesus. These family particulars so closely resemble what is reported in Acts xxi. 9 of the evangelist that it is hardly tenable to think of two different men of the same name in this connection. Error in the Book of Acts is the less likely since it is precisely there that the reports are from an eyewitness. It is evident that Polycrates erroneously held the Philip of Hierapolis to be the apostle, though this does not exclude the proposition that his particulars in regard to the Evangelist Philip are correct. In comparison with these details the statements of Caius of Rome (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, III., xxxi.) are not so exact. It is probably due to a confusion of the two named Philip that Clement of Rome (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, III., xxx. 1) asserts that the Apostles Peter and Philip had begotten children, and that Philip had given his daughters in second marriage. Neither are those communications of Eusebius himself quite clear (III., xxxi.) which have arisen from a combination of what is stated by Polycrates and by Caius. Confusion of the apostle with the evangelist may have been easier because of the possibility that the two lived at the same time in Asia Minor. The later

tradition was that the evangelist died as bishop at Tralles; that the apostle died and was buried in Ephesus. F. SIEFFERT.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Because of the confusion noted in the text, the literature named under PHILIP THE APOSTLE covers in large part the subject of this article. Consult the commentaries on Acts (e.g., G. T. Stokes, in *Expositor's Bible*, vol. i., chaps. xvii., xx., London and New York, 1891), and the works on the apostolic age (e.g., A. C. McGiffert, pp. 73–74, 95, 340, 424, New York, 1897); T. Zahn, in *Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, vi (1900), 158 sqq.; *DB*, iii. 836–837; Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire*, part xxxi., cols. 270–272; *ASB* for June 6; Harnack, *Litteratur*, ii. 1, pp. 357–358, 368, 669.

PHILIP OF GORTYNA: Christian apologist; flourished in the last half of the second century. He is mentioned with praise in the letter of Dionysius of Corinth to the Christian community at Gortyna (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, IV., xxiii. 5; Eng. transl., *NPNF*, 2 ser., i. 201); and wrote in the time of Marcus Aurelius a reply to Marcion (mentioned only by Eusebius, IV., xxv., *NPNF*, ut sup., p. 203). Jerome (*De vir. ill.*, xxx.) is dependent upon Eusebius. (G. KRÜGER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The sources are indicated in the text. Consult further: Harnack, *Litteratur*, i. 237; *DCB*, iv. 355; C. A. Bernoulli, *Der Schriftstellerkatalog des Hieronymus*, p. 334 et passim, Freiburg, 1895.

PHILIP OF HESSE.

Early Life and Embracing of Protestantism (§ 1).
Introduction of the Reformation in Hesse (§ 2).
Suspected of Zwinglianism (§ 3).
Leader of the Schmalkald League (§ 4).
Bigamous Marriage (§ 5).
Overtures to the Emperor (§ 6).
Resumption of Hostility to Charles (§ 7).
Imprisonment of Philip and Interim in Hesse (§ 8).
Closing Years (§ 9).

Philip of Hesse, or Philip the Magnanimous, landgrave of Hesse from 1509 to 1567 and one of the most powerful promoters of the Protestant Reformation, was born at Marburg Nov. 13, 1504; d. at Cassel Mar. 31, 1567. His father died when Philip was five years old, and in 1514 his mother, Anna of Mecklenburg, after a series of struggles with the estates of Hesse, succeeded in becoming regent for him. The controversies still continued, however, so that, to put an end to them, Philip was declared to have attained his majority in 1518, his actual assumption of power beginning in the following year. The power of the estates had been broken by his mother, but he owed her little else. His education had been very imperfect, and his moral and religious training had been neglected. Despite all this, he developed rapidly as a statesman, and soon began to take steps to increase his personal authority as a ruler.

1. Early Life and Embracing of Protestantism.

The first meeting of Philip of Hesse with Luther was in 1521 at the Diet of Worms, where he was attracted by the Reformer's personality, though he had at first little interest in the religious elements of the situation. It was only after his marriage with Christina, the daughter of George of Saxony, early in 1524, that he began to take an active part in forwarding the cause of the Reformation. The impulse to this activity came from his reading Luther's translation of the Bible, and his nascent Protestantism was fostered by meeting Melanchthon in the spring of 1527. As early as 1524 he had encouraged the spread of the new doctrines in his territories and he now professed open adherence to the tenets of Luther, refusing to follow the counsel of the clergy, his mother, or his father-in-law, all of whom urged him to repress the spread of the new teaching by force. He openly approved of Luther's position in the Peasant War, declaring that it was not the result of the Protestant movement; he refused to be drawn into the anti-Lutheran league of George of Saxony in 1525; and by his alliance with the Elector John of Saxony, concluded at Gotha Feb. 27, 1526, showed that he was already taking steps to organize a protective alliance of all Protestant princes and powers. At the same time he united political motives with his religious policy, aiming, as early as the spring of 1526, to prevent the election of Archduke Ferdinand as emperor of the Holy Roman Empire. At the Diet of Speyer (1526) Philip openly championed the Protestant cause, rendering it possible for Protestant preachers to propagate their views while the Diet was in session, and, like his followers, openly disregarding ordinary Roman Catholic ecclesiastical usages.

Although there was no strong popular movement for reforming Hesse, Philip determined to organize the church there according to Protestant principles. In this he was aided not only by his chancellor, the humanistic Feige (Ficinus) of Lichtenau, and his chaplain, Adam Krafft (q.v.), but also by the ex-Franciscan François Lambert (q.v.), a fanatical enemy of the faith he had left. While the violent policy of Lambert, embodied, at least in part, in the Homberg church order (see HOMBERG SYNOD AND CHURCH ORDER OF 1526) was abandoned, and an essentially Lutheran type of organization was adopted, the monasteries and religious foundations were dissolved; their property was applied to charitable and scholastic purposes; and the University of Marburg was founded in the summer of 1527 to be, like Wittenberg, a school for Protestant theologians. Philip's father-in-law and the bishops of Würzburg and Mainz were active in agitating against the growth of the new heresy, and the combination of several circumstances, including rumors of war, convinced Philip of the existence of a secret league among the Roman Catholic princes. His suspicions were confirmed to his own satisfaction by a forgery given him by an adventurer who had been employed in important missions by George of Saxony, one Otto von Pack; and after meeting with the Elector John of Saxony at Weimar Mar. 9, 1528, it was agreed that the Protestant princes should take the offensive in order to protect their territory from invasion and capture. Both Luther and the elector's chancellor, Brück, though convinced of the existence of the conspiracy, counseled strongly against acting on the offensive. The imperial authorities at Speyer now forbade all breach of the peace, and, after long negotiations, Philip succeeded in extorting the expenses for his armament from the dioceses of Würzburg, Bamberg,

2. Introduction of the Reformation in Hesse.

and Mainz, the latter bishopric also being compelled to recognize the validity of ecclesiastical jurisdiction in Hessian and Saxon territory until the emperor or a Christian council should decide to the contrary. The condition of affairs was, however, very unfavorable to Philip, who might easily be charged with disturbing the peace of the empire, and at the second Diet of Speyer, in the spring of 1529, he was publicly ignored by the emperor. Nevertheless, he took an active part in uniting the Protestant representatives, as well as in preparing the celebrated protest of Speyer; and before leaving the city he succeeded in forming, on Apr. 22, 1529, a secret understanding between Saxony, Hesse, Nuremberg, Strasburg, and Ulm.

3. Suspected of Zwinglianism.

Philip was especially anxious to prevent division over the subject of the Lord's Supper. Through him Zwingli was invited to Germany, and Philip thus prepared the way for the celebrated debate at Marburg (see MARBURG, CONFERENCE OF). Although the attitude of the Wittenberg theologians frustrated his attempts to bring about harmonious relations, and although the situation was still further complicated by the position of George, margrave of Brandenburg, who demanded a uniform confession and a uniform church order, Philip held that the differences between Strasburg and the followers of Luther in their sacramental theories admitted of adjustment, and that the erring could not scripturally be rejected and despised. The result was that Philip was suspected of a tendency toward Zwinglianism. At the same time, the results of a conference with the elector of Saxony and with Margrave George at Schleiz (Oct. 3), the anger of the emperor at receiving from Philip a statement of Protestant tenets, composed by the ex-Franciscan Lambert, and the landgrave's failure to secure any common action on the part of the Protestant powers regarding the approaching Turkish war, all tended to draw him closer to the Swiss and the Strasburg Reformers. He eagerly embraced Zwingli's plan of a great Protestant alliance to extend from the Adriatic to Denmark to keep the Holy Roman emperor from crossing into Germany. This association caused some coldness between himself and the followers of Luther at the Diet of Augsburg in 1530, especially when he propounded his irenic policy to Melanchthon and urged that all Protestants should stand together in demanding that a general council alone should decide concerning religious differences. This was supposed to be indicative of Zwinglianism, and Philip soon found it necessary to explain his exact position on the question of the Lord's Supper, whereupon he declared that he fully agreed with the Lutherans, but disapproved of persecuting the Swiss.

The arrival of the emperor put an end to these disputes for the time being; and when Charles demanded that the Protestant representatives should take part in the procession of Corpus Christi, and that Protestant preaching should cease in the city, Philip bluntly refused to obey. He now sought in vain to secure a modification of the tenth article of the Augsburg Confession; but when the position of the Upper Germans was officially rejected, Philip left the diet directing his representatives manfully to uphold the Protestant position, and to keep general, not particular, interests constantly in view. At this time he offered Luther a refuge in his own territories, and began to cultivate close relations with Martin Butzer, whose comprehension of political questions constituted a common bond of sympathy between them, and who fully agreed with the landgrave on the importance of compromise measures in treating the controversy on the Lord's Supper.

4. Leader of the Schmalkald League.

In 1530 Philip was successful in accomplishing the purpose for which he had so long worked by securing the adhesion of the Protestant powers to the Schmalkald League (see SCHMALKALD, LEAGUE AND ARTICLES OF), which was to protect their religious and secular interests against interference from the emperor. The landgrave and his ally, the elector of Saxony, became recognized leaders of this union of German princes and cities. Philip kept clearly in view the necessity of an anti-Hapsburg policy, and was thoroughly convinced that the Protestant cause depended on the weakening of the Hapsburgs both at home and abroad.

Before engaging in hostilities, Philip attempted to accomplish the ends of Protestant policy by peaceful means. He proposed a compromise on the subject of the confiscated church property, but at the same time he was untiring in providing for a possible recourse to war, and cultivated diplomatic relations with any and all powers whom he knew to have anti-Hapsburg interests. A peaceful turn was, however, given to the situation by the arrangements made at Nuremberg July 25, 1532 (see NUREMBERG, RELIGIOUS PEACE OF), though this did not prevent Philip from preparing for a future struggle. He was untiring in trying to draw new allies into the league against Charles V. and Ferdinand, who had been invested with the duchy of Württemberg; the battle of Lauffen (May 13, 1534) cost Ferdinand his newly acquired possession; and Philip was now recognized as the hero of the day, and his victory as the victory of the Schmalkald League. In the years following this coalition became one of the most important factors in European politics, largely through the influence of Philip, who lost no opportunity of furthering the Protestant cause. Its alliance was sought by both France and England; it was extended for a period of ten years in 1535; and new members were added to it. On the other hand, the struggle between the two Protestant factions injured the advancement of their mutual interests, and Butzer, encouraged by Philip, was accordingly occupied in the attempt to bring Protestants together on a common religious platform, the result being the Concord of Wittenberg (see WITTENBERG, CONCORD OF). The emperor's fears as to the political purpose of the league were, for the time being, set at rest; but at the same time a council which should include representatives of the pope was rejected; and measures were taken to secure the permanence of the Protestant cause in the future. In 1538–39 the relations between Roman Catholics and Protestants became

strained almost to the breaking-point, and war was averted only by the Frankfort Respite (q.v.). The Protestants, however, failed to avail themselves of their possible opportunities, largely through the unwonted docility and pliability of Philip.

This unexpected course of the Protestant leader was largely conditioned by two factors: he was weakened by a licentious life, and his marital relations were about to bring scandal on all Protestantism. Within a few weeks after his marriage to the unattractive and sickly Christina of Saxony, who was also alleged to be an immoderate drinker, Philip had committed adultery; and as early as 1526 he had begun to consider the permissibility of bigamy. He accordingly wrote Luther for his opinion, alleging as a precedent the polygamy of the patriarchs; but Luther replied (Nov. 28, 1526) that it was not enough for a Christian to consider the acts of the patriarchs, but that he, like the patriarchs, must have special divine sanction. Since, however, such sanction was lacking in the present case, Luther advised against such a marriage, especially for Christians, unless there was extreme necessity, as, for example, if the wife was leprous, or abnormal in other respects. Despite this discouragement, Philip gave up neither his project nor a life of sensuality which kept him for years from receiving communion. He was affected by Melanchthon's opinion concerning the case of Henry VIII., where the Reformer had proposed that the king's difficulty could be solved by his taking a second wife better than by his divorcing the first one. To strengthen his position, there were Luther's own statements in his sermons on Genesis, as well as historical precedents which proved to his satisfaction that it was impossible for anything to be un-Christian that God had not punished in the case of the patriarchs, who in the New Testament were held up as models of faith. It was during an illness due to his excesses that the thought of taking a second wife became a fixed purpose. It seemed to him to be the only salve for his troubled conscience, and the only hope of moral improvement open to him. He accordingly proposed to marry the daughter of one of his sister's ladies-in-waiting, Margarethe von der Saale. While the landgrave had no scruples whatever, Margarethe was unwilling to take the step unless they had the approval of the theologians and the consent of the prince elector of Saxony and of Duke Maurice. Philip easily gained his first wife's consent to the marriage. Butzer, who was strongly influenced by political arguments, was won over by the landgrave's threat to ally himself with the emperor if he did not secure the consent of the theologians to the marriage; and the Wittenberg divines were worked upon by the plea of the prince's ethical necessity. Thus the "secret advice of a confessor" was won from Luther (see LUTHER, § 21) and Melanchthon (Dec. 10, 1539), neither of them knowing that the bigamous wife had already been chosen. Butzer and Melanchthon were now summoned, without any reason being assigned, to Rotenburg-on-the-Fulda, where, on Mar. 4, 1540, Philip and Margarethe were united. The time was particularly inauspicious for any scandal affecting the Protestants, for the emperor, who had rejected the Frankfort Respite, was about to invade Germany. A few weeks later, however, the whole matter was revealed by Philip's sister, and the scandal caused a painful impression throughout Germany. Some of Philip's allies refused to serve under him; and Luther, under the plea that it was a matter of advice given in the confessional, refused to acknowledge his part in the marriage.

5. Bigamous Marriage.

This event had affected the whole political situation. Even while the marriage question was occupying his attention, Philip was engaged in constructing far-reaching plans for reforming the Church and for drawing together all the opponents of the house of Hapsburg, though at the same time he did not give up hopes of reaching a religious compromise through diplomatic means. He was bitterly disgusted by the criticism directed against him, and feared that the law which he himself had enacted against adultery might be applied to his own case. In this state of mind he now determined to make his peace with the emperor on terms which would not involve desertion of the Protestant cause. He offered to observe neutrality regarding the imperial acquisition of the duchy of Cleves and to prevent a French alliance, on condition that the emperor would pardon him for all his opposition and violation of the imperial laws, though without direct mention of his bigamy. The advances of Philip, though he declined to do anything prejudicial to the Protestant cause, were welcomed by the emperor; and, following Butzer's advice, the landgrave now proceeded to take active steps with the hope of establishing religious peace between the Roman Catholics and Protestants. Secure of the imperial favor, he agreed to appear at the Diet of Regensburg, and his presence there contributed to the direction which affairs took at the Regensburg religious colloquy (see REGENSBURG, CONFERENCE OF), in which Melanchthon, Butzer, and Johannes Pistorius the elder represented the Protestant side. Philip was successful in securing the permission of the emperor to establish a university at Marburg; and in return for the concession of an amnesty, he agreed to stand by Charles against all his enemies, excepting Protestantism and the Schmalkald League, to make no alliances with France, England, or the duke of Cleves, and to prevent the admission of these powers into the Schmalkald League. On the other hand, the emperor agreed not to attack him in case there was a common war against all Protestants.

6. Overtures to the Emperor.

These arrangements for special terms led to the collapse of Philip's position as leader of the Protestant party. He had become an object of suspicion, and, although the league continued to remain in force, and gained some new adherents in succeeding years, its real power had departed. But while of the secular princes only Albrecht of Mecklenburg and Henry of Brunswick were still faithful to the Roman Catholic cause, and while united action might at the time easily have resulted in the triumph of Protestantism, there was no union; Duke Maurice and Joachim II. of Brandenburg would not join the Schmalkald League; Cleves was suc-

cessfully invaded by the imperial troops; and Protestantism was rigorously suppressed in Metz.

In 1543 the internal dissensions of the league compelled Philip to resign from its leadership, and to think seriously of dissolving it. He put his trust entirely in the emperor's good faith, agreeing to help him against both the French and the Turks. At the Diet of Speyer in 1544 he championed the emperor's policy with great eloquence; the bishop of Augsburg declared he must be inspired by the Holy Spirit; and Charles now intended to make him commander-in-chief in the next war against the Turks.

7. Resumption of Hostility to Charles.

The situation was suddenly changed, however, and Philip was tardily forced again into the opposition, by the peace of Crespy (Sept., 1544), which opened his eyes to the danger threatening Protestantism. He prevented the Roman Catholic Duke Henry of Brunswick from taking forcible possession of his dominions; he unsuccessfully planned a new alliance with German princes against Austria, pledging its members to prevent the acceptance of the decrees of the projected Council of Trent; when this failed, he sought to secure the neutrality of Bavaria in a possible war against the Protestants; and he proposed a new Protestant alliance to take the place of the Schmalkald League. But all this, like his projected coalition with the Swiss, was prevented by the jealousy prevailing between Duke Maurice and the elector of Saxony. Fearful of the success of these plans, the emperor invited Philip to an interview at Speyer (Mar. 28, 1546). Philip spoke plainly in criticism of the emperor's policy, and it was soon evident that peace could not be preserved. Four months later (July 20, 1546) the imperial ban was declared against John Frederick and Philip as perjured rebels and traitors. The result was the Schmalkald war, the outcome of which was unfavorable to Protestant interests. The defeat at Mühlberg (Apr. 24, 1547) and the capture of the Elector John Frederick marked the fall of the Schmalkald League. In despair Philip, who had been negotiating with the emperor for some time, agreed to throw himself on his mercy, on condition that his territorial rights should not be impaired and that he himself should not be imprisoned. These terms were disregarded, however, and on June 23, 1547, both the leaders of the famous league were taken to south Germany and held as captives.

8. Imprisonment of Philip and Interim in Hesse.

The imprisonment of Philip brought the Church in Hesse into great trials and difficulties. It had previously been organized carefully by Philip and Butzer, and synods, presbyteries, and a system of discipline had been established. The country was thoroughly protestantized, though public worship still showed no uniformity, discipline was not strictly applied, and many sectaries existed. The Interim (q.v.) was now introduced, sanctioning Roman Catholic practises and usages. Philip himself wrote from prison to forward the acceptance of the Interim, especially as his liberty depended upon it. As long as the unrestricted preaching of the Gospel and the Protestant tenet of justification by faith were secured, other matters seemed to him of subordinate importance. He read Roman Catholic controversial literature, attended mass, and was much impressed by his study of the Fathers of the Church. The Hessian clergy, however, boldly opposed the introduction of the Interim and the government at Cassel refused to obey the landgrave's commands. Meanwhile his imprisonment was made still more bitter by the information which he received concerning conditions in Hesse, and the rigor of his confinement was increased after he had made an unsuccessful attempt to escape. It was not until 1552 that the Peace of Passau gave him his long-desired freedom and that he was able, on Sept. 12, 1552, to reenter his capital, Cassel.

9. Closing Years.

Though Philip was now active in restoring order within his territories, new leaders—Maurice of Saxony and Christopher of Württemberg—had come to the fore. Philip no longer desired to assume the leadership of the Protestant party. All his energies were now directed toward finding a basis of agreement between Protestants and Roman Catholics. At his direction his theologians were prominent in the various conferences where representative Roman Catholics and Protestants assembled to attempt to find a working basis for reunion. Philip was also much disturbed by the internal conflicts that arose after Luther's death between his followers and the disciples of Melanchthon. He was never wearied in urging the necessity of mutual toleration between Calvinists and Lutherans, and to the last cherished the hope of a great Protestant federation, so that, with this end in view, he cultivated friendly relations with French Protestants and with Elizabeth of England. Financial aid was given to the Huguenots, and Hessian troops fought side by side with them in the French religious civil wars, this policy contributing to the declaration of toleration at Amboise in Mar., 1563. He gave permanent form to the Hessian Church by the great agenda of 1566–67, and in his will, dated in 1562, urged his sons to maintain the Augsburg Confession and the Concord of Wittenberg, and at the same time to work in behalf of a reunion of Roman Catholics and Protestants if opportunity and circumstances should permit. (T. Kolde.)

Bibliography: As a source employ: M. Lenz, *Briefwechsel Landgraf Philipps des Grossmüthigen . . mit Bucer, 1541–47*, 3 parts, Leipsic, 1880–91. Matter of pertinence is to be found in the literature under Butzer, Martin; Luther, Martin; Melanchthon, Philipp; Reformation; and the various articles named in the text. For the English reader the fullest account accessible is probably to be found in J. Janssen, *Hist. of the German People*, vols. v.–vii., St. Louis, 1903–05. Consult further: C. von Rommel, *Philipp der Grossmüthige*, 3 vols., Giessen, 1830; P. Hoffmeister, *Das Leben Philipps des Grossmüthigen*, Cassel, 1846; P. A. F. Walther, *Landgraf Philipp von Hessen*, Darmstadt, 1866; J. Wille, *Philipp der Grossmüthige und die Restitution Ulrichs von Wirtemberg, 1526–1535*, Tübingen, 1882; S. Ehses, *Landgraf Philipp von Hessen und Otto von Pack*, Freiburg, 1886; A. Heidenhain, *Die Unionspolitik Landgrafen Philipps des Grossmütigen, 1557–62*, Breslau, 1886; W. Falckenheiner, *Philipp der Grossmüthige im Bauernkriege*, Marburg, 1887; J. B. Rady, *Die Reformatoren in ihrer Beziehung zur Doppelehe des Landgrafen Philipp*, Frankfort, 1890; O. Winckelmann,

Der schmalkaldische Bund, 1530–32, Strasburg, 1892; G. Turba, *Verhaftung und Gefangenschaft des Landgrafen Philipp von Hessen*, Vienna, 1896; S. Issleib, *Die Gefangennahme des Landgrafen Philipp von Hessen*, Hamburg, 1899; *Philipp des Grossmütige, Beiträge zur Geschichte seines Lebens und seiner Zeit*, Marburg, 1901; *Festschrift zum Gedächtnis Philipps der Grossmütigen*, Cassei, 1904; Schenk, *Philip der Grossmütige, Landgrafen von Hessen (1504-67)*, Frankenberg, 1904; W. W. Rockwell, *Die Doppelehe des Landgrafen Philipp von Hessen*, Marburg, 1904; *Cambridge Modern History*, vol. iii. passim, London and New York, 1905; A. von Drach and G. Könnecke, *Die Bildnisse Philipps des Grossmütigen*, Marburg, 1905; Schaff, *Christian Church*, vol. vi. passim.

PHILIP THE MAGNANIMOUS. See PHILIP OF HESSE.

PHILIP NERI, SAINT. See NERI, PHILIP.

PHILIP OF SIDE: Church historian; b. at Side (the modern Eski Adaliah; 92 m. s.w. of Konieh, the ancient Iconium), Pamphylia; flourished about 420. He studied under Rhodon at the catechetical school in Alexandria, and while still a young man became the head of the branch school established by Rhodon, probably at Philip's suggestion, in Side about 405. Later he was a priest in Constantinople, where he was an intimate friend of Chrysostom; and he was a candidate for the patriarchate of Constantinople against Sisinnius (425), Nestorius (428), and Maximianus (431). He seems to have been identical with the Byzantine presbyter Philip, who was commended by Cyril of Alexandria for refusing to associate with the heretical Nestorius, and whom the Alexandrine patriarch sought to reconcile with Maximianus, when the latter succeeded the deposed heresiarch. It is also very possible that Philip may have spent some time in Antioch and Amida.

From the statements of Socrates (*Hist. eccl.*, VII., xxvii.), Photius (*Bibliotheca*, xxxv.), and Nicephorus (*Hist. eccl.*, xiv. 29) it is clear that Philip of Side was a man of extraordinary learning and diligence, but more diffuse than accurate. Among his numerous books, which dealt with many themes, the most important were his " History of Christianity " and his polemic against the Emperor Julian. Of his writings, however, only scant fragments have survived, these being merely of an average character. A number of his fragments have been edited by Carl de Boor (*ZKG*, vi. 478–494; *TU*, v. 165–184), and his history seems also to have influenced the " Religious Conference at the Sassanid Court " (ed. Eduard Bratke, in *TU*, xix., part 3, 1899). A few other fragments of Philip's writings are known to exist, and it is possible that he was also the author of the still unedited *De tinctura œris Persici et de tinctura œris Indici.* (E. BRATKE†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A. Wirth, *Aus orientalischen Chroniken*, pp. 208 sqq., Frankfort, 1894; O. Bardenhewer, *Patrologie*, pp. 332–333, Freiburg, 1901, Eng. transl., St. Louis, 1908; idem, in *KL*, ix. 2022–23; F. Kampers, *Alexander der Grosse und die Idee des Weltimperiums in Prophetie und Sage*, pp. 116–135, Freiburg, 1901; *DCB*, iv. 356; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, viii. 535.

PHILIP THE TETRARCH (4 B.C.–34 A.D.): Son of Herod the Great and of Cleopatra, a woman of Jerusalem. He was educated in Rome. For his tetrarchate and rule see HEROD AND HIS FAMILY, II., § 3. He was a gentle and gracious prince, who always resided in his own territories and was ever ready to give aid and justice to his people. Philip's coins bear the representation of the emperor and the device of a temple, which is more probably the temple of Augustus at Cæsarea than the sanctuary at Jerusalem. His reign of thirty-seven years was almost contemporaneous with the life of Jesus, who sometimes traversed Philip's dominions. When the latter died in 33 or 34 A.D., his land became a part of the province of Syria and was administered as an imperial domain.

There is some difficulty in bringing Mark vi. 17 (Matt. xiv. 3) into agreement with Josephus, *Ant.*, xviii. 137, where Philip is said to have married Salome, the daughter of his brother Herod Antipas and of his niece Herodias, while Mark makes Philip the first husband of Herodias herself, and states that she left him to marry Herod. Some interpreters suppose that two sons of Herod the Great bore the name of Philip, one of them being also called Herod; others again think that there must be some error either in Josephus or in Mark. It is probable that the latter confused two brothers, one of whom was the father and the other the husband of Salome.

E. VON DOBSCHÜTZ.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Consult the literature under HEROD AND HIS FAMILY, and add to that S. Mathews, *Hist. of New Testament Times in Palestine*, New York, 1899.

PHILIPPI, fi-lip'pi, **FRIEDRICH ADOLPH:** German Lutheran; b. at Berlin Oct. 15, 1809; d. at Rostock Aug. 29, 1882. Although a Jew by birth, he soon began to consider the problem of the truth of Christianity. He became a convert when he was sixteen years old, but out of respect to his parents he was not baptized until four years later. After completing his education at the universities of Berlin (1827–29) and Leipsic (1829–30), he taught at Dresden (1830–32) and Berlin (1833–34), but withdrew from active life to devote himself to the private study of theology, especially dogmatics and exegesis. In 1837 he became privat-docent for theology in the University of Berlin, whence he was called to Dorpat in 1841 as professor of dogmatics and moral theology. Here he took a lively interest in the ecclesiastical questions of the day, contributing much to strengthen the position of Lutheranism in Russian territory. In 1851 he was called to Rostock as professor of New-Testament exegesis, in which capacity he successfully opposed the theology of Johann Hofmann and Michael Baumgarten (qq.v.). In addition to his professorial duties, Philippi was appointed a theological examiner in 1856, and a consistorial councilor in 1874. Among his writings are: *De Celsi adversarii Christianorum philosophandi genere* (Berlin, 1836); *Der thätige Gehorsam Christi, ein Beitrag zur Rechtfertigungslehre* (1841); *Commentar über den Brief Pauli an die Römer* (3 parts, Erlangen and Frankfort, 1848–52; Eng. transl. by J. S. Banks, 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1878–79); *Kirchliche Glaubenslehre* (6 vols., Gütersloh, 1854–79); *Predigten und Vorträge* (edited by F Philippi, 1883); *Symbolik, akademische Vorlesungen* (edited by the same, 1883); and *Erklärung des Briefes Pauli an die Galater* (edited by the same, 1884). (FERDINAND PHILIPPI†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *Mecklenburgisches Kirchen- und Zeitblatt*, 1882, nos. 19–21; M. A. Landerer, *Neueste Dogmengeschichte*, p. 215 et passim, Heilbronn, 1881.

PHILIPPI, JACOBUS: German Roman Catholic; author of the *Reformatorium vitæ clericorum* (Basel, 1494); b. at Külchhoffen or Kilchen (now Kirchhoffen, a hamlet near Freiburg) about 1435; d. apparently after 1510. In 1463 he matriculated in the theological faculty at Basel. Here he edited a gradual (Basel, 1488) and a breviary (1492), and also lectured on various books of the Bible, especially on the Pauline epistles. In 1464 he was a member of the committee of advisement on the university statutes. In scholastic philosophy he was a realist. Of his activity little is known; but it is evident that he was inclined toward the Brethren of the Common Life (see COMMON LIFE, BRETHREN OF THE), making his will in favor of their house at Zwolle in 1486. He was attracted to the community primarily by his brother Ludwig, who had become one of their number at Zwolle in 1472, and who died there as rector of the Brethren in 1490. The statement in Johann Butzbach's *Auctarium de scriptoribus ecclesiasticis* that Jacobus Philippi was still living after 1508 seems to be confirmed by a title-deed of 1510.

Among Philippi's writings Butzbach makes special mention of the *Sermons ad populum* (thus far undiscovered) and of the *Præcordiale sacerdotum devote celebrare cupientium utile et consolatorium* (Strasburg, 1489). His chief work, however, was his *Reformatorium* (first printed at Basel, 1494, not 1444, as a misprint led many to suppose), directed against evils in the life of the clergy. As a remedy Philippi recommended the community of the Brethren of the Common Life. The close of the book admonishes against the misuse of benefices accumulated in the hands of a single holder. In all his reform measures Philippi shows himself in harmony with many of his contemporaries. L. SCHULZE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Biographical material is to be found in the *Reformatorium;* scattered notices are collected by L. Schulze in *ZKW*, 1886, pp. 88 sqq., and by Schöngen in the "Chronicle" of Jacobus Trajecti published by the Historical Society of Utrecht, 1903. Consult further: J. Hürbin, *Peter von Andlau*, Strasburg, 1897; idem, *Handbuch der schweizerischen Geschichte*, ii. 87 sqq., Stans, 1902.

PHILIPPIANS, EPISTLE TO THE. See PAUL THE APOSTLE, II.

PHILIPPINE ISLANDS: The most northern group of the Malay Archipelago, situated between the Pacific Ocean on the east and the Sea of China on the west and south of Japan and north of the islands of Borneo and Celebes, and included between latitude 4° 40′ and 21° 10′ north and longitude 116° 40′ and 126° 34′ east. The archipelago consists of 3,141 islands, most of which are very small; the total land area is 115,026 square miles; population, 7,635,426. The principal islands are as follows: Luzon (area, 40,969 square miles; population, 3,798,507), Mindanao (area, 36,292; population, 499,634), Samar (area, 5,031; population, 222,690), Negros (area, 4,881; population, 460,776), Panay (area, 4,611; population, 743,646), Palawan (area, 4,027; population, 10,918), Mindoro (area, 3,851; population, 28,361), Leyte (area, 2,722; population, 357,641); and Cebu (area, 1,762; population, 592,247).

Geographical Description.

The islands were discovered by Ferdinand Magellan in 1521; were conquered by the Spanish from Mexico under Legaspi; and were subject to the crown of Spain, until, by the treaty of Paris, Dec. 10, 1898, they were ceded to the United States by right of conquest and for the additional consideration of $20,000,000. Upon taking possession the United States proceeded to reorganize the civil and judicial administration of the islands. Religious liberty was guaranteed by the treaty of Paris. The general government is modeled after that of the United States. The executive is composed of the governor-general who is the head of a commission of eight members appointed by the president of the United States and assigned as heads of the different departments. The commission serves as the upper house of legislation and the lower is elected by the people. The Supreme Court, composed of four American and three native judges, is also appointed by the American president. A limited franchise is granted to the natives outside of the Mohammedan islands. The population known as the Filipinos is not homogeneous, but consists of numerous tribes speaking many languages. The aborigines were the Negritos, who now number only 23,500; they are black, dwarfish, woolly-haired, thick-lipped, and dwell in the remote parts of the islands. The Malay or brown races constitute nine-tenths of the population, of which the principal are the Tagalogs, Visayans, Ilocanos, Moros, Bicals, and Igorrotes. There are small elements of negroes brought by the Spanish from Africa and Papua; of Indians brought from Mexico, Mongoloids, and whites. Immediately after the establishment of American sovereignty, a system of free public schools was established. In 1905–06 the average attendance per month was 375,554 out of a total of 1,200,000 between the ages of six and fifteen. In the latter year there were 3,340 schools (primary, intermediate, and high), 4,719 native, and 831 American teachers. The Roman Catholics in 1903 maintained 1,004 private schools with an enrolment of 63,545, and 325 religious schools with an enrolment of 26,478.

Historical and Political.

When the Spanish took possession their design was the establishment of a politico-religious sovereignty. The picturesque ceremonials of the Roman Catholic Church appealed to the natives, whose adherence to their own religious beliefs was weak while they were disunited by their diversities and rivalries. Great numbers of missionary friars of the Augustinian, Franciscan, Dominican, and Recollet orders came to the islands, to each of whom a charge was assigned. They labored with great success, the entire body of people yielding rapidly to conversion. At present only eight and one-half per cent of the inhabitants are classed as wild, while all the others are termed civilized. This was the result mainly of the devotion of the friars to parochial instruction and to the spiritual and physical welfare of the natives. The

Religious History; Roman Catholics.

Jesuits likewise participated in the work; but, becoming the richest and most powerful order, they aroused the jealousy of the others and were recalled in 1767. In 1850 they were given permission to return. The bishopric erected in 1581 was made suffragan to Mexico, and in 1595 it was raised to metropolitan rank with three suffragan bishoprics; to which a fourth was added in 1867, which was, however, merged in one of the others in 1874. With these at the head of the Church stood the provincials of the four great orders named above. The members of these orders or regular clergy greatly preponderated in numbers and influence over the secular clergy composed mostly of natives. The domestic history of the archipelago, naturally secluded, was parochial; consisting of missionary extension and political and industrial progress subject to the religious interest and the will of the friars, with an occasional conflict between the archbishop and the latter. Finally, the leaven of western forces finding various access bore fruit, and the insurrections of 1896 and 1898 constituted an upheaval for the overthrow of the land-holding friars and the political and economic stagnation resulting from their long undisputed occupation. One of the demands of the revolutionists was their expulsion. With the insurrection of 1896 a priest, Aglipay by name, placed himself at the head of a seceding religious or antipapal party, entitled Independent Catholic Church. After negotiations between the United States' government and Pope Leo XIII. in 1907 it was agreed that the United States pay $7,000,000 for the friar lands and that the Church send no friar as priest into any parish after a final objection by the governor-general. The majority of the people are Roman Catholics of whom there are 3,940,000, besides 3,000,000 Independent Catholics. Every village as established by the Spanish had its central church. Most of these buildings were of stone and many were elaborate structures. In 1903 there were 1,608 churches of which 1,573 were Roman Catholic, and in the city of Manila alone there were 51. The Moros of the Sulu Archipelago, southern Mindanao, and Palawan in the southwest, who were the least affected by the Spanish occupation, about 270,000, are Mohammedan. Buddhists of Asiatic derivation number 75,000 and Animists 260,000.

Protestant Missions.

Immediately after the Spanish cession, various Protestant churches in the United States took steps to enter the field by adopting in conference a plan of cooperation and union having in view the erection of "La Iglesia Evangelica Filipina," as the national church of the Filipinos. The Presbyterian Church established a permanent mission in 1899; the Methodist Episcopal, the same year; the Baptist in 1900; the Protestant Episcopal and Christian (Disciples) in 1901; the United Brethren in 1902; and the Congregational in 1903. In Apr., 1901, a federation of missions and churches was formed in Manila called "The Evangelical Union of the Philippine Islands." The field was to be mutually divided with Manila as the common center. The Presbyterian Board opened stations on Luzon, at Laguna and Albay, in 1903, and at Tayabas in 1906; at Iloilo, Panay, in 1900; at Dumaguete, Negros, in 1901; and in Cebu in 1902. The Ellinwood School at Manila became a theological seminary in 1907, conducted jointly by the Methodist Episcopal bishop and the presbytery. In 1901 the Silliman Industrial Institute was established at Dumaguete. In 1908, 63 outstations were opened and the 20 churches had 4,127 members. In 1900 the Methodist Episcopal Church assumed the occupation of northern Luzon divided into three districts, which became a district conference in 1904. In 1908 there were 108 churches in the seven outstations with 25,000 communicants and 35,000 adherents. The American Baptist Missionary Union occupied the Visayan islands of Panay and Negros in the south in 1900, with Iloilo as a center. The work has been extended into Cebu. By 1908 there were 25 churches with 2,838 members. The Brotherhood of St. Andrew sent out two clergymen and two laymen in 1899, who established the Mission of the Holy Trinity. In 1901 Bishop Brent arrived and the islands became a mission district of the Protestant Episcopal Church. A cathedral and settlement-house have been established at Manila for the English-speaking people, and stations scattered among the natives. The Foreign Christian Missionary Society (Disciples), with stations at Manila, Laoag, Vigan, and Aparri, laying much stress on evangelistic work, have 29 churches and 2,505 members. The American Board planted a mission on Mindanao in 1901 and has a station at Davao and an outstation at Santa Cruz; and in 1908 the Mindanao Missions Medical Association was formed in New York. The missions of the various denominations generally combine the industrial, medical, educational, and evangelizing features. There are (1908) 7 societies with 212 stations and outstations, 126 missionaries, 492 native helpers, 18 schools with 519 pupils, 8 hospitals, 194 churches with 35,000 communicants and 45,000 adherents, exclusive of Protestant Episcopalians.

THEODORA CROSBY BLISS.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: For lists of literature consult: A. P. C. Griffin, Library of Congress, *List of Works Relating to Philippine Islands*, Washington, 1905; J. A. Robertson, *Bibliography of the Philippine Islands*, Cleveland, 1908; and Richardson, *Encyclopaedia*, p. 851. Works on geography and description are: J. Montero, *El Archipiélago Filipino*, Madrid, 1886; J. Foreman, *The Philippine Islands*, London, 1899; R. Reyes Lala, *The Philippine Islands*, New York, 1899; S. MacClintock, *The Philippines*, New York, 1903; H. C. Stuntz, *The Philippines and the Far East*, Cincinnati, 1904; F. W. Atkinson, *The Philippine Islands*, Boston, 1905; J. A. Le Roy, *Philippine Life in Town and Country*, New York, 1905; D. C. Worcester, *Philippine Islands and their People*, New York, 1907. For ethnology consult: D. G. Brinton, *Peoples of the Philippines*, Washington, 1898; A. B. Meyer, *The Distribution of the Negritos in the Philippine Islands*, Dresden, 1899; F. Blumenthal, *Die Philippinen. Eine Darstellung der ethnographischen Verhältnis des Archipels*, Hamburg, 1900; F. H. Sawyer, *The Inhabitants of the Philippines*, London, 1900; G. A. Koeze, *Bijdrage tot de Anthropologie der Philippijnen*, Haarlem, 1901–04; D. Folkmar, *Album of Philippine Types*, Manila, 1904; *Ethnological Survey Publications*, Manila, 1905 sqq. On the history consult: M. Halstead, *Story of the Philippines*, New York, 1898; A. K. Fiske, *Story of the Philippines*, New York, 1899; J. Foreman, *Philippine Islands*, New York, 1899; A. March, *Hist. of the Philippines*, New York, 1899; E. H. Blair and J. A. Robertson, *The Philippine Islands, 1493–1803*, Cleveland, 1903; idem, *The Philippine Islands, 1493–1898*, 55 vols., ib. 1903–08

(giving text and translation of innumerable documents—a monumental work); A. J. Brown, *The New Era in the Philippines*, New York, 1903; A. de Morga, *Hist. of the Philippine Islands*, 2 vols., Cleveland, 1907; D. B. Barrows, *History of Philippines*, New York, 1908. For the religious side consult: A. Coleman, *The Friars in the Philippines*, Boston, 1899; J. T. Medina, *El Tribunal de la Inquisición en las Islas Filipinas*, Santiago, 1899; F. Colin, *Labor Evangelica, Ministeros de los Obreros de la Compañía de Jesus . . . en las Islas Filipinas*, 3 vols., Barcelona, 1900–1902; E. Zamora, *Las Corporaciones religiosas en Filipinas*, Valladolid, 1901. For accounts of evangelical missionary work consult: H. O. Dwight, *The Blue Book of Missions*, pp. 68–69, New York, 1907; and the annual reports of the missionary societies at work there.

PHILIPPISTS.

Before Luther's Death (§ 1).
Opposition to Melanchthon (§ 2).
Open Conflict (§ 3).
Lutheran Strictures (§ 4).
Downfall of the Philippists (§ 5).
Estimate of Philippism (§ 6).

Philippists was the designation usually applied in the latter half of the sixteenth century to the followers of Philipp Melanchthon (q.v.). It probably originated among the opposite or Flacian party (see FLACIUS, MATTHIAS), and

1. Before Luther's Death.

was applied at first to the theologians of the universities of Wittenberg and Leipsic, who were all adherents of Melanchthon's distinctive views, especially those in which he approximated to Roman Catholic doctrine on the subject of free will and the value of good works, and to the Swiss Reformers' on the Lord's Supper. Somewhat later it was used in Saxony to designate a distinct party organized by Melanchthon's son-in-law Caspar Peucer (q.v.), with George Cracovius, Johann Stössel (q.v.), and others, to work for a union of all the Protestant forces, as a means to which end they attempted to break down by this attitude the barriers which separated Lutherans and Calvinists. Melanchthon had won, by his eminent abilities as a teacher and his clear, scholastic formulation of doctrine, a large number of disciples among whom were included some of the most zealous Lutherans, such as Matthias Flacius and Tileman Hesshusen (qq.v.), afterward to be numbered among the vehement opponents of Philippism; both of whom formally and materially received the forms of doctrine shaped by Melanchthon. As long as Luther lived, the conflict with external foes and the work of building up the Evangelical Church so absorbed the Reformers that the internal differences which had already begun to show themselves were kept in the background.

But Luther was no sooner dead than the internal as well as the external peace of the Lutheran Church declined. It was a misfortune not only for Melanchthon, but for the whole body that he, who had

2. Opposition to Melanchthon.

formerly stood as a teacher by the side of Luther, the real leader, was now forced suddenly into the position of head not only of the University of Wittenberg but of the entire Evangelical Church of Germany. There was among certain of Luther's associates, notably Nikolaus von Amsdorf (q.v.), a disinclination to accept his leadership. When in the negotiations set on foot with reference to the Augsburg Interim (see INTERIM) by the Elector Maurice in 1548 he showed himself increasingly ready to yield and make concessions, he ruined his position with a large part of the Evangelical theologians for all time; and an opposition party was formed, in which the leadership was at once assumed by Flacius in view of his learning, controversial ability, and inflexible firmness. Melanchthon, on the other hand, with his faithful followers (Camerarius, Major, Menius, Pfeffinger, Eber, Cruciger, Strigel [qq.v.]), and others saw in the self-styled genuine Lutherans naught but a narrow and contentious class, which, ignoring the inherent teaching of Luther, sought to domineer over the church by letter and name, and in addition to assert its own ambitious self. On the other hand, the Philippists regarded themselves as the faithful guardians of learning over against the alleged "barbarism," and as the mean between the extremes. The genuine Lutherans also claimed to be representatives of the pure doctrine, defenders of orthodoxy, and heirs of the spirit of Luther. Personal, political, and ecclesiastical animosities widened the breach; such as the rivalry between the Ernestine branch of the Saxon house (now extruded from the electoral dignity) and the Albertine branch; the jealousy between the new Ernestine University of Jena and the electoral universities of Wittenberg and Leipsic, in both of which the Philippists had the majority; and the bitter personal antagonism felt at Wittenberg for Flacius, who assailed his former teachers harshly and made all reconciliation impossible.

The actual conflict began with the controversy over the Interim and the question of *Adiaphora* (see ADIAPHORA AND THE ADIAPHORISTIC CONTROVERSY) in 1548 and the following years. In the

3. Open Conflict.

negotiations concerning the Leipsic Interim the Wittenberg theologians as well as Johann Pfeffinger and the intimate of Melanchthon, George of Anhalt (q.v.), were on the side of Melanchthon, and thus drew upon themselves the violent opposition of the strict Lutherans, under the leadership of Flacius, who now severed his connection with Wittenberg. When the Philippist Georg Major (q.v.) at Wittenberg and Justus Menius (q.v.) at Gotha put forth the proposition that good works were necessary to salvation, or as Menius preferred to say "the new obedience, the new life, is necessary to salvation," they were not only conscious of the danger that the doctrine of justification by faith alone would lead to antinomianism and moral laxity but they manifested a tendency to bring into account the necessary connection of justification and regeneration: namely, that justification as possession of forgiving grace by faith is indeed not conditioned by obedience; but also that the new life is presupposed by obedience and works springing out of the same justification. But neither Major nor Menius was sufficiently firm in his view to stand against the charge of denying the doctrine of justification and going over to the Roman camp, and thus they were driven back to the general proposition of justification by faith alone. The Formula of Concord (q.v.) closed the controversy by avoiding both extremes, but failed to offer a final solution of the ques-

tion demanded by the original motive of the controversy. The synergistic controversy (see SYNERGISM), breaking out about the same time, also sprang out of the ethical interest which had induced Melanchthon to enunciate the doctrine of free will in opposition to his previous predestinarianism. After the clash in 1555 between Pfeffinger (who in his *Propositiones de libero arbitrio* had held closely to the formula of Melanchthon) and Amsdorf and Flacius, Strigel went deeper into the matter in 1559 and insisted that grace worked upon sinful men as upon personalities, not natural objects without a will; and that in the position that there was a spontaneous cooperation of human powers released by grace there was an actual lapse into the Roman Catholic view. The suspicions now entertained against Melanchthon and his school were quickened by the renewed outbreak of the sacramentarian controversy in 1552. Joachim Westphal (q.v.) accused Melanchthon of agreement with Calvin, and from this time the Philippists rested under the suspicion of Crypto-Calvinism. The more the German Lutherans entertained a dread of the invasion of Calvinism, the more they mistrusted every announcement of a formula of the Lord's Supper after the form of Luther's doctrine yet obscure. The controversy on this subject, in which Melanchthon's friend Hardenberg of Bremen (see HARDENBERG, ALBERT RIZAEUS) was involved with Timann (q.v.) and then with Hesshusen, leading to his deposition in 1561, elevated the doctrine of ubiquity to an essential of Lutheran teaching. The Wittenberg pronouncement on the subject prudently confined itself to Biblical expressions and forewarned itself against unnecessary disputations, which only strengthened the suspicion of unavowed sympathy with Calvin.

The strict Lutherans sought to strike a decisive blow at Philippism. This was apparent at the Weimar meeting of 1556 and in the negotiations of Coswig and Magdeburg in this and the following years, which showed a tendency to work not so much for the reconciliation of the contending parties as for a personal humiliation of Melanchthon.

4. Lutheran Strictures.

He, although deeply wounded, showed great restraint in his public utterances; but his followers in Leipsic and Wittenberg paid their opponents back in their own coin. The heat of partizan feeling was displayed at the Conference of Worms in 1557, where the Flacian party did not hesitate, even in the presence of Roman Catholics, to show their enmity for Melanchthon and his followers. After several well-meant attempts at pacification on the part of the Lutheran princes, the most passionate outbreak occurred in the last year of Melanchthon's life, 1559, in connection with the "Weimar Confutation" published by Duke John Frederick, in which together with the errors of Servetus, Schwenckfeld, the Antinomians, Zwingli, and others, the principal special doctrines of the Philippists (Synergism [q.v.], Majorism, see MAJORISTIC CONTROVERSY, adiaphorism) were denounced as dangerous errors and corruptions. It led, however, to discord among the Jena theologians themselves, since Strigel defended against Flacius Melanchthon's doctrine on sin and grace, and drew upon himself very rough treatment from the impetuous duke. But the ultimate outcome was the decline of the University of Jena, the deposition of the strict Lutheran professors and the replacing of them by Philippists. It seemed for the time that the Thuringian opposition to the Philippism of Electoral Saxony was broken; but with the downfall of John Frederick and the accession of his brother John William to power, the tables were turned; the Philippists at Jena were again displaced (1568–69) by the strict Lutherans, Johann Wigand (q.v.), Cölestin, Kirchner, and Hesshusen, and the Jena opposition to Wittenberg was once more organized, finding voice in the *Bekenntnis von der Rechtfertigung und guten Werken* of 1569. The Elector August was now very anxious to restore peace in the Saxon territories, and John William agreed to call a conference at Altenburg (Oct. 21, 1568), in which the principal representatives of Philippism were Paul Eber and Caspar Cruciger the younger, and of the other side Wigand, Cölestin, and Kirchner. It led to no result, although it continued until the following March. The Philippists asserted the Augsburg Confession of 1540, the *loci* of Melanchthon of the later editions, and of the *Corpus Philippicum*, met by the challenge from the other side that these were an attack upon the pure teaching and authority of Luther. Both sides claimed the victory, and the Leipsic and Wittenberg Philippists issued a justification of their position in the *Endlicher Bericht* of 1571, with which is connected the protest of the Hessian theologians in conference at Ziegenhain in 1570 against Flacian Lutheranism and in favor of Philippism.

5. Downfall of the Philippists.

Pure Lutheranism was now fortified in a number of local churches by *Corpora doctrinæ* of a strict nature, and the work for concord went on more and more definitely along the lines of eliminating Melanchthonism. The Philippists, fully alarmed, attempted not only to consolidate in Electoral Saxony but to gain ascendency over the entire German Evangelical Church, but met their downfall first in Electoral Saxony. The conclusion of the Altenburg Colloquy prompted the elector, in Aug., 1569, to issue orders that all the ministers in his domains should hold to the *Corpus doctrinæ Philippicum*, intending thus to avoid Flacian exaggerations and guard the pure original doctrine of Luther and Melanchthon in the days of their union. But the Wittenberg men interpreted it as an approval of their Philippism, especially in regard to the Lord's Supper and the person of Christ. They pacified the elector, who had become uneasy, by the *Consensus Dresdensis* of 1571, a cleverly worded document; and when on the death of John William, in 1574, August assumed the regency in Ernestine Saxony and began to drive out not only strict Lutheran zealots like Hesshusen and Wigand, but all who refused their subscription to the *Consensus*, the Philippists thought they were on the way to a victory which should give them all Germany. But the unquestionably Calvinistic work of Joachim Cureus (q.v.), *Exegesis perspicua de sacra cœna* (1574), and a confidential letter of Johann Stössel (q.v.) which

fell into the elector's hands opened his eyes. The heads of the Philippist party were imprisoned and roughly handled, and the Torgau Confession of 1574 completed their downfall. By the adoption of the Formula of Concord their cause was ruined in all the territories which accepted it, although in some others it survived under the aspect of a modified Lutheranism, as in Nuremberg, or, as in Nassau, Hesse, Anhalt, and Bremen, where it became more or less definitely identified with Calvinism. It raised its head once more in Electoral Saxony in 1586, on the accession of Christian I., but on his death five years later it came to a sudden and bloody end with the murder of Nicolaus Krell (q.v.) as a victim to this unpopular revival of Calvinism.

6. Estimate of Philippism.

Though it may be regretted that the moderate, pacific, and enlightened spirit of Melanchthon himself was not allowed to have more influence in the Lutheran Church and that his estimable points of departure from Luther remained unrecognized, yet it can not be denied that Philippism was only something halfway, while it claimed to guard the genuine religious ideas and motives of the Reformation better than the doctrine of the Formula of Concord. Nor must the fact be overlooked that where, after the promulgation of the Formula, Philippism still maintained its ground, it produced no results in the domain of theology which can be compared for a moment with those which proceeded from the stricter school. The latter won its victory to a great extent because it gave birth to the greater number of popularly effective writings and powerful literary personalities. Melanchthon's spirit, however, yet remained operative in the seventeenth century, even though at the end of the sixteenth his influence was greatly superseded by that of orthodox Lutherans. The movement initiated by Georg Calixtus (q.v.) shows not only considerable affinity with its tendency, but has a direct historical connection with it through his Helmstedt teachers, especially Johann Caselius (q.v.), who was a personal disciple of Melanchthon.

(G. KAWERAU.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Perhaps the best method of mastering the subject treated in the foregoing article is a study of the men mentioned in the text as active by means of the articles in this work and of the literature appended to those articles. Especially valuable are the letters of Melanchthon and the accounts of his life and activities. Much of the literature under FORMULA OF CONCORD is valuable. The works on the history of the Church and of the doctrine of the period are also to be consulted. Besides the foregoing consult: V. E. Löscher, *Historia motuum zwischen den Evangelisch-Lutherischen und Reformirten*, Frankfort, 1723; G. J. Planck, *Geschichte der Entstehung und der Veränderung . unsers protestantischen Lehrbegriffs*, vols. iv.–vi., 6 vols., Leipsic, 1791–1800; H. Heppe, *Geschichte des deutschen Protestantismus 1555–81*, 4 vols., Marburg, 1852–59; idem, *Dogmatik des deutschen Protestantismus im 16. Jahrhundert*, 3 vols., Gotha, 1857; A. Beck, *Johann Friedrich der Mittlere*, 2 vols., Weimar, 1858; E. L. T. Henke, *Neuere Kirchengeschichte*, ii. 274 sqq., Halle, 1878; G. Wolf, *Zur Geschichte der deutschen Protestanten 1555–59*, Berlin, 1888; H. E. Jacobs, *The Book of Concord*, vol. ii., Philadelphia, 1893; W. Möller, *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte*, ed. G. Kawerau, 3d ed., vol. iii., Tübingen, 1907; Schaff, *Creeds*, i. 258–340.

PHILIPPUS SOLITARIUS: Greek monk of the late eleventh century. In 1095 he completed, apparently at Constantinople, his mystic and devotional "Mirror," a dialogue in political verse which represents Body and Soul as setting forth their mutual relations as factors of human nature, and as making preparation for death. The Greek text is still unedited, except for scanty fragments (ed. P. Lambecius, *Commentarii de bibliotheca Cæsarea Vindobonensi*, v. 76–84, Vienna, 1778; C. Oudin, *Commentarius de scriptoribus ecclesiæ antiquis*, ii. 851, Frankfort, 1722; J. B. Cotelerius, on Apostolic Constitutions, viii. 42, in his *Sanctorum Patrum qui temporibus apostolicis floruerunt opera*, 2 vols., Paris, 1672), but was translated into Latin prose by the Jesuit Jacobus Pontanus (Ingolstadt, 1604; most convenient reprint in *MPG*, cxxvii. 701–902). Closely akin to the "Mirror" is the short poem "Lamentations" (ed. E. Auvray, Paris, 1875; E. S. Shuckburgh, in *Emmanuel College Magazine*, vol. v.), which may in reality be the eighth book of the "Mirror," which was omitted by Pontanus. A new redaction of both poems was prepared by Phialites in the twelfth century, and the Vienna manuscripts of the "Mirror" contain noteworthy additions, especially on the dogmas and rites of the Armenians, Jacobites, and Romans (the two former portions ed. F. Combefis, *Auctuarium novum bibliothecæ Græco-Latinorum patrum*, ii. 261, 271, Paris, 1648. (PHILIPP MEYER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, pp. 742–744; P. Lambecius, *Commentarium de . . bibliotheca Cæsarea Vindobonensi*, v. 76–84, Vienna, 1778; *KL*, ix. 2023.

PHILIPS, OBBE. See MENNONITES, VI.

PHILISTINES, fi-lis'tinz or tainz.

Name and Territory (§ 1). Early History (§ 4).
Origin (§ 2). Later History (§ 5).
Not Semitic (§ 3). The Cities (§ 6).

In the Hebrew the Philistines are known as *Pelishtim* or *Pelishtiyyim*, and their country as *Pelesheth*. In the Greek they appear as *Phulistieim* or *Philistieim*, *Phulistiaioi*, and sometimes as *allophuloi*, "foreigners"; and in the Vulgate as *Philisthiim*, *Philistini*, and *Palæstini*, the last recalling the usage of Josephus (see PALESTINE, I., § 1). The expression *allophuloi* dates from about the period of the beginning of the Septuagint, has reference to a distinction based on national and religious grounds, and designates all not Jews who are of oriental origin and dwell in Palestine, and particularly the Philistines. The territory occupied by the Philistines was the southern part of the coast of Palestine. Taking Joppa (the modern Jaffa) as the most northern and Raphia as the most southern Philistine city, the length of the territory was rather less than sixty miles, with a width varying between twelve and thirty-five miles. The eastern boundary was the hill country of Judea, and the whole territory was included within what was known as the Shephelah. The significance of the district lay in the coast cities, not so much because of their sea trade as of their importance for overland traffic, as they were situated on one of the principal trade routes between Egypt and Babylon. Their location brought them into relation with the two centers of early culture and yet secured for them a rela-

1. Name and Territory.

tive independence, removed from both as they were either by a great distance or by the desert. The coast is almost without natural harbors, the hinterland possessed a few small plains, and toward the south the country gradually becomes transformed into pasture land.

The first reports of this district come from Egyptian inscriptions and from the Amarna Tablets (q.v.). Thothmes III. (c. 1500 B.C.) reckoned the district to the land of Ḥaru. The Amarna Tablets mention Gaza, Ashkelon, and Joppa. Especially instructive is the portrayal at Karnak of the conquest of Ashkelon by Rameses II.

2. Origin.

(c. 1280), in which the defenders of the fortress are shown as distinct from the Philistines both in dress and countenance and as identical with Canaanites, proving that the inhabitants at that time were of the same race as those of Upper Palestine and that a foreign people had not yet intruded. This fact is confirmed by the names which come from this period, which are of Semitic-Canaanitic type. Deut. ii. 23 affirms that the Avvim dwelt here until the Caphtorim entered and destroyed them; Josh. xiii. 3, cf. xi. 22, implies that the Avvim and the Philistines lived alongside each other. The culture of the region was like that of other parts of Palestine, except that Egyptian influence was felt more strongly. The Old Testament (cf. Amos ix. 7) thus agrees with other information that the Philistines were intruders, and Jer. xlvii. 4 is in accord with other passages in deriving them from Caphtor (q.v.), the identification of which is not yet settled. A connection of the Philistines with the Cherethites of I Sam. xxx. 14–15 and with the *Carim*, " captains," of II Kings xi. 4, 19 (cf. the gloss on Gen. x. 14), supposed to be from Caria in Asia Minor, has been attempted, but the combination is uncertain, even in view of I Kings i. 38, where Cherethites and Pelethites (or Philistines) are mentioned as part of the royal guard, and no certain datum is gained for determining the place of origin of the Philistines. The Egyptian monuments of the period of Rameses III. (1208–1180 B.C.) speak of unrest in northern and central Syria caused by a foreign and hitherto unnamed people, whose names are read *Purasati, Zakkari, Shakrusha, Dano* or *Danona, Washasha,* and *Shardana.* Of these the Purasati are always named first, and, it is assumed, were the leaders. The fact that these peoples marched with a great amount of baggage and with wives and children is taken by E. Meyer as proving that it was the migration of a people which pushed on to the borders of Egypt. W. M. Müller argues from the application to them of the name equivalent to " heroes " that they were predatory bands of soldiers plundering alike friend and foe. Rameses III. speaks of a land battle with them and also of a sea fight. The Golenisheff papyrus relates that the Egyptian Uno-Amon journeyed in a ship to Dor in Palestine for timber during the fifth year of Herihor, the last king of the twentieth Egyptian dynasty, and that the city then belonged to the Zakkari, whose chief was named Bidir. It is noteworthy that this people's name occurs both in the time of Rameses and of Herihor, in the former in connection with the Purasati, and that with Rameses the Egyptian hegemony of southern Syria begins to vanish; it is further probable that since the Zakkari made sure their footing, their associates the Purasati also did. With the Purasati the Egyptologist Champollion connected the Philistines before 1832, and this identification has approved itself to later scholars. W. M. Müller supposed the pronunciation to have been Pulaesti, cf. the Assyrian *Palastu, Pilistu.* This scholar has located their home on the southern coast of Asia Minor and in the islands of the Ægean Sea. A sea people was known to the Egyptians as *Ruku* or *Luku* (Lycians). An attempt to derive the name from a Semitic root meaning " to wander " does not approve itself, since it is practically certain that the Philistines were not of Semitic stock, and the Egyptians gave to the peoples of Syria their own names, describe the Philistines and their associates as coming from " the end of the sea," and portray them as differing in feature and dress from Semites. It is not unlikely that between the Philistines and their associates and the " early Cretans " of Odyssey xix. 176 a relationship existed, but definite proof is lacking.

Proof from the language of the Philistines is lacking, since practically nothing is known of it, and the occurrence of persons and places in the Old Testament and Assyrian inscriptions helps little, since the Philistines naturally adopted the language of the country after their settlement therein. The Semitic names of places, upon which F. Schwally bases his argument that the Philistines were Semites proves nothing, since these names often remain unaltered in the East through successive waves of population. The Achish of I Sam. xxvii.–xxviii. has been placed alongside the *Ikausu* of the Assyrian Inscriptions (cf. Schrader, *KAT,* 3d ed., p. 473), a form " Ekasho of the land of Kefti " found in an Egyptian source, which seems to make a non-Semitic origin of this name clear. The Old Testament calls in several places (Josh. xiii. 3; Judges iii. 3; I Sam. vi. 4, 16) the rulers of the Philistines *seranim,* " lords," a word which does not yield readily to a Hebrew (Semitic) etymology, and Klostermann (on I Sam. v. 8) has equated it with the Gk. *tyrannos.* The deities of the Philistines appear to be Semitic—cf. Dagon, Ashtaroth, and Beelzebub (qq.v.). This people had images in their temples and took them when they went to war as did the Hebrews the ark (II Sam. v. 21); Isa. ii. 6 shows that their soothsayers were held in honor. Those who visited the temple of Dagon avoided stepping on the threshold (I Sam. v. 5; cf. Zeph. i. 9). But these observances are in accordance with Semitic custom. The general impression, however, received from a view of the facts is that the Philistines were not of Semitic stock, and were intruders into the land where they adopted Semitic customs and language. [The name of Goliath, with its Aramaic ending—*ath,* does not contradict the theory of the non-Semitic origin of the Philistines, since he is described as belonging to the Giants (q.v.; cf. II. Sam. xxi. 15–19; I Chron. xx. 4–8; both in accord with Josh. x. 22), who are recorded as descended from the Avvim or Anakim. Descendants of the old stock would be reckoned by outlanders to the

3. Not Semitic.

dominant people, even though their descent was not forgotten. G. W. G.]

This is confirmed by the further fact that they did not practise circumcision (Judges xiv. 3, xv. 18; I Sam. xvii. 26, xviii. 25), with which should be put the fact that the "sea folk" of Merneptah were uncircumcised (W. M. Müller, *Asien und Europa*, pp. 357–358, Leipsic, 1893), and with these the *Purasati* of Rameses were connected. For the time when they entered Palestine the Golenisheff papyrus (ut sup.) gives a suggestion, since the date of Herihor is about 1100. The Bidir of Dor had received an Egyptian embassy sixteen years earlier, and the Egyptians had bought timber of his father and grandfather. Hence the Zakkari had been settled in the region some fifty or sixty years before the time of the papyrus, and this goes back approximately to the time of Rameses III. (ut sup.). This comes into close connection with the unrest caused by the dissolution of the Hittite realm in northern Syria. By 1100 the Philistines had at least partly subjected the Hebrews, and it would appear that shortly after they had firmly seated themselves in the lowlands of Judea they attacked the mountain region. Their success was won probably not through greater numbers but by means of better weapons and cleverer tactics. The Egyptian monuments show that they were equipped with felt helmets, coats of mail, large round shields, short spears, large swords, and war chariots. If they came from Asia Minor, they must have possessed the Mycenean culture and were by no means "barbarians."

When the Philistines came into touch with Israel, their territory was divided into five districts, the chiefs of which were called *seranim*, "lords." The capitals of these districts, named from north to south, were Ekron, Ashdod, Gath, Ashkelon, and Gaza. This fivefold division may correspond to tribal divisions. The Old Testament names the Cherethites as occupying the northwestern part of the Negeb, and these with the Zakkari may make up two outside groups of the same stock. Since Achish is called "king" in I Sam. xxi. 10 and elsewhere, he may have been the head of the Philistine confederation; an alternative supposition is that the Hebrew writer used the ordinary terminology. Inasmuch as during the reign of Rameses III. the Egyptian boundaries reached to Lebanon, while Dor was apparently in the possession of the Zakkari, it seems probable that their advance along the great highway of commerce by way of Carmel took place after the Egyptian power suffered a decline. It appears strange that the region about Dor and the Plain of Sharon was not reckoned in with the five districts of the Philistines, for when the battle of Gilboa was fought, these regions must have been in their power. The southernmost limits of their territory had been attained when they reduced Israel. The mention of the Philistines which appears in such passages as Gen. xxvi., cf. xxi. 22–23, are anachronisms, since the Egyptian monuments do not indicate settlement in what became their territory before the twentieth dynasty. The migration of the Danites (Judges xviii.) may have been due to the Philistines. In the long contest between the Philistines and Israel, the former appear as the aggressors, with the purpose of conquering the highland, the middle portion of which came into their power according to I Sam. v.–vi. The lower portion is shown by the story of Samson to have been already under their control (Judges xiii.–xvi., cf. iii. 31). The fear of this people was so great among the Hebrews that many of the latter entered their ranks against their own kin (I Sam. xiv. 21). While Saul began the period of successful resistance, his reign was rather one of little contests with them than a serious campaign for freedom. At this time David (q.v.) became a beloved leader of his people (I Sam. xviii. 7) against the common foe. When Saul turned against David, the latter took refuge with Achish of Gath, who gave him Ziklag as his residence. The last battle between Saul and the Philistines took place at the foot of Mount Gilboa, where Saul and his sons fell, and the earlier hegemony of the Philistines was reestablished. Ishbosheth established his capital at Mahanaim, and David became king over Judah in Hebron (II Sam. ii.–iv.). When the latter became king over all Israel, the Philistines regarded the act as one of revolt and sought to maintain their mastery. David knew, however, the advantage which was his in the possession of the highlands, and in numerous great and small conflicts (II Sam. v. 17–25, xxi. 15–22, xxiii. 9–17) not only secured the freedom of his people but reduced the Philistines to a position of subjection, at least in part, though their position on the highway enabled them still to profit by overland commerce. Gittites (from Gath) were in David's army (II Sam. xv. 18), as well as the Cherethites and Pelethites, who were probably of Philistine blood. The theory of W. M. Müller that the victory of David was due to the Philistines having at the same time to resist an attack by the Egyptians has little to sustain it; David's success was partly due to the advantage of position. In Solomon's time Egypt sought to reestablish her hegemony over the region (I Kings ix. 16), and to this may be due the fact that Dor was independent of Israel. But the result was such a weakening of the Philistines that the Plain of Jezreel and Carmel, the key to the trade route, fell into Solomon's hands and with it command of commerce. When Shishak made his raid, the Philistines seem to have given him no trouble, since no mention is made of capture of plunder with reference to them. The territory of the Philistines, as it is reflected in the Old Testament, seems to picture the situation as it was after Solomon's time.

4. Early History.

From that time there appears little which indicates an independent development of the Philistines. The conflicts between them and Israel have little significance. Rehoboam fortified his dominion against them by a line of strongholds (II Chron. xi. 7–12). Nadab and Elah fought with them at Gibbethon (I Kings xv. 27, xvi. 15 sqq.); Jehoshaphat received tribute from them (II Chron. xvii. 11), but the harem of Jehoram was carried off by them (II Chron. xxi. 16–17). Gath seems to have been taken from Judah by Hazael (II Kings xii. 17), while Uzziah carried on a victorious campaign

5. Later History.

against them (II Chron. xxvi. 6), though against Ahab the Philistines became aggressive (II Chron. xxviii. 18), but were subjected under Hezekiah (II Kings xviii. 8). This people were included in the denunciations of the prophets (Amos i. 6–8; Jer. xxv. 15 sqq.; Ezek. xxv. 15, and elsewhere). They were subdued by the Assyrians, and in that period Gaza had especial importance because of the trade route to Arabia; and the region figures in the Assyrian annals with frequency. Sargon deported the inhabitants of Ashdod and Gath and settled foreigners in their place (711 B.C.). Zidka of Ashkelon and Hezekiah united against the Assyrians in 701, dethroned the Assyrian vassal king of Ekron, but the prior status was restored by Sennacherib. On the downfall of the Assyrians, the Egyptians once more tried to control the region, and Psammeticus is said to have besieged Ashdod for twenty-nine years (Herodotus, *Hist.*, ii. 157); about this time that city is reported by the same author (i. 105) to have been plundered by the Scythians. Necho II. made another attempt to control Syria, but Nebuchadrezzar was the victor. Neither at that time nor in the time of Cyrus do the Philistines appear as aggressive. Under Darius Philistia, Phenicia, and Cyprus belonged to the fifth satrapy. Gaza was an independent city flourishing through its commerce, but was taken by Alexander after a siege of two months, while under the Seleucidæ its fortunes were frequently changed, especially in the contest between Egypt and Syria (see PTOLEMIES; SELEUCIDÆ). In the Maccabean contest for independence, the cities of the Philistines were the centers of hard battles. Bacchides sought to shut the Jews out from the plain; Jonathan attacked and plundered Joppa, took Ashdod, received Ekron from Alexander, while Ashkelon surrendered (I Macc. v. 68, ix. 50–52, x. 75–89); Simon took Joppa and settled Jews there, and also took Gezer (I Macc. xii. 33–34, xiii. 43–48); while Alexander Jannæus seems to have completed the reduction of the region (Josephus, *Ant.*, XIII., xiii. 3, xv. 4; *War*, I., iv. 2). Pompey freed it from the Jewish yoke, but Cæsar gave Joppa back to the Jews. Antony gave the region to Cleopatra in 36 B.C., but in 30 through the gift of Augustus part of it was in Herod's hands. After the fall of Jerusalem, Jamnia became the center of Jewish Palestine. But long before this most that was distinctively Philistine had vanished. During the Persian period Greeks had settled in the country and cities and had gained control of commerce. It is significant that the coins of Gaza of the Persian period contain lettering partly Phenician and partly Greek, but of Greek workmanship. The government was on Greek models, the gods bore Greek names, while the cities were centers of Greek culture. While this is true, the rural population used the Aramaic tongue, as did the lower classes in the cities, at the end of the fourth century B.C.; moreover, the Greek names of deities but concealed local conceptions; the chief temple of Ashdod in the Hasmonean period was Dagon's, Gaza's chief deity was Marnas (Aramaic for " Our Lord ").

6. The Cities.

For **Dor** see SAMARIA. **Japho** (Joppa, the modern Jaffa) was one of the border cities of Dan (Josh. ix. 46), later the seaport of Jerusalem (II Chron. ii. 16), and seems to have been a city of great age, possessing a Canaanitic population in the time of the eighteenth and nineteenth Egyptian dynasties. The Amarna Tablets show an Egyptian governor for the place. Later it must have been in the hands of the Philistines. The New Testament speaks of it as visited by Peter (Acts ix. 36–43). It has retained its importance through the centuries because of its port, though the protection afforded is not of the best. The story of Andromeda centers at this place. In the fourth century it was the seat of a bishop. At the present time it is the seaport of Jerusalem, with which it is connected by rail, has about 45,000 inhabitants, and is celebrated for its gardens. About twelve miles south of Joppa and about five miles from the coast is the modern Jebna, which corresponds to the **Jabneh** of II Chron. xxvi. 6 and the **Jabneel** of Josh. xv. 11; it is the **Jamnia** of II Macc. xii. 8. About six miles inland the village of 'Akir probably locates the site of **Ekron**, variously assigned to Dan and to Judah (Josh. xix. 43, xv. 45–46; cf. however Josh. xiii. 2–3). The name of **Ashdod** (Gk. *Azotos*) is preserved in the modern Esdud, a village with about 3,000 inhabitants situated on the trade route about midway between Joppa and Gaza. The city was reckoned to Judah (Josh. xv. 47; but cf. xiii. 2–3). The account of the conquest of the city by Uzziah in II Chron. xxvi. 6 seems doubtful in view of Amos i. 7. [This rhetorical passage, however, does not imply the independence of Ashdod.] Neh. iv. 1 probably refers not merely to the inhabitants of the city but to those of the outlying territory which reached to the limits of Gezer. The Evangelist Philip visited Ashdod (Acts viii. 40). In the early Christian centuries a distinction was made between Ashdod-on-the-Sea and Ashdod-Within, the former probably represented by the ruins of Minet al-Ḳal'a. The name of **Ashkelon** is also preserved in the modern 'Aṣḳalan, about ten miles south of Ashdod and about thirteen miles north of Gaza. The ruins on the site of the present village appear to date only from the Middle Ages; apparently there were two sites other than this, one near the sea and one inland, a distinction which is supported by reports of a bishop of Ashkelon and one of Mayumas Ashkelon. Ruins exist quite near a little haven, and also others at the present El-Hammame and El-Mejdel to the northeast of the ruins of the time of the Middle Ages. It is in these last ruins that the sanctuaries of the early city are to be found. Ashkelon was a Roman colony in the fourth Christian century. **Gaza** is to be sought at the present Ghazze, situated a little over two miles from the coast, at the present a market place of some importance. Underground streams nourish fine groves of olive-trees and palms. Its haven was mentioned by Strabo and Ptolemy, and by Constantine the Great it was made a city with the name Constantia; its privileges were taken away by Julian, and it was known thereafter as Mayumas. Near one of the gates of the present city is a Mohammedan sanctuary dedicated to " the Strong one," i.e., Samson. Walls which are found under the present town were built over the city founded by Gabinius, the commander of Pompey's

army, in 61 B.C. The earlier city lay somewhat to the north, and was destroyed by Alexander Jannæus 96 B.C. Still farther to the south lay **Raphia**, the modern Tell Refah, about two miles from the sea and without a harbor. It marked the boundary between the Egyptian and Syrian domains (Josephus, *War*, IV., xi. 5). **Gath** lay nearer the land of Judah, according to I Sam. xvii. 1–2, 52, near the Wadi el-Sunt, and according to Eusebius (Onomasticon, ed. Lagarde, 244, 127, cf. 246, 129) about four miles to the north of Eleutheropolis toward Lydda (Diospolis). Jerome (on Mic. i. 10) asserts that it lay on the way from Eleutheropolis to Gaza. It early ceased to be a Philistine city (II Kings xii. 17; cf. Jer. xxv. 20; Amos i. 7; Zeph. ii. 4).

(H. GUTHE.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The literature on Hebrew history should be consulted as indicated under AHAB; and ISRAEL, HISTORY OF. The older literature directly hearing on the subject is noted in K. B. Stark, *Gaza und die philistäische Küste*, Jena, 1852. Consult: G. Baur, *Der Prophet Amos*, pp. 76–94, Giessen, 1847; V. Guérin, *Description de la Palestine*, ii. 36 sqq., Paris, 1869; A. Hannecker, *Die Philistäer*, Eichstädt, 1872; W. M. Thomson, *The Land and the Book*, vol. i., New York, 1882; E. Meyer, *Geschichte des Alterthums*, i. 317 sqq., 358 sqq., Stuttgart, 1884; F. Schwally, in *ZWT*, xxxiv (1891), 103–108, 265 sqq.; J. F. McCurdy, *History, Prophecy and the Monuments*, vol. i.–ii., passim, New York, 1894–96; idem, in *The Expositor* ("Uzziah and the Philistines"), 1890; G. A. Smith, *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, chap. ix., London, 1897; R. Raahe, *Petrus der Iberer*, Leipsic, 1895; C. Clermont-Ganneau, *Études d'archéologie orientale*, x. 1–9, Paris, 1896; W. M. Müller, in *Mittheilungen der vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft*, v (1900), 1–42; also his *Asien und Europa*, cited in the text; R. Dussaud, *Questions mycéniennes*, Paris, 1905; M. A. Meyer, *Hist. of the City of Gaza*, New York, 1907; E. Meyer, *Der Diskus von Phaestos und die Philister auf Kreta*, Berlin, 1909; Robinson, *Researches*, vol. ii.; Schrader, *KAT*, passim; *DB*, iii. 844–848; *EB*, iii. 3713–3727; *JE*, x. 1–2; Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire*, fasc. xxxi (1908), 286–300.

PHILLIPS, PHILIP: Methodist Episcopal Gospel singer; b. in Chautauqua Co., N. Y., Aug. 13, 1834; d. in Delaware, Ohio, June 25, 1895. Brought up on a farm, he developed a talent for song; received some training in the country singing-school and later studied under Lowell Mason. He conducted his first singing-class at Alleghany, N. Y., in 1853, and after that similar schools in adjacent towns and cities. In 1860 he changed from the Baptist to the Methodist Episcopal Church. He brought out *Early Blossoms* (1860). The next year he opened a music-store in Cincinnati, and published *Musical Leaves* (Cincinnati, 1862). During the Civil War he aided the Christian Commission by raising funds with his *Home Songs* and services of song throughout the country. He visited England and prepared *The American Sacred Songster* (London, 1868) for the British Sunday-school Union, of which 1,100,000 copies were sold. Later he made a tour of the world holding praise services in the Sandwich Islands, Australia, New Zealand, Palestine, Egypt, India, and the cities of Europe. Other published collections are *Spring Blossoms* (Cincinnati, 1865); *Singing Pilgrim* (New York, 1866); *Day School Singer* (Cincinnati, 1869); *Gospel Singer* (Boston, 1874); *Song Sermons* (New York, 1877). He wrote also *Song Pilgrimage around and throughout the World*, with an introduction by J. H. Vincent and a biographical sketch by A. Clark (Chicago, 1880).

PHILIPPS (PHILIPZOON), UBBO. See UBBONITES.

PHILLPOTTS, HENRY: Church of England bishop of Exeter; b. at Bridgewater (50 m. s.w. of Bristol), Somerset, May 6, 1778; d. at Bishopstowe, Torquay (29 m. e.n.e. of Plymouth), Sept. 18, 1869. He was educated at Corpus Christi, Oxford (B.A., 1795), was elected a fellow at Magdalen College, and prelector of moral philosophy in 1800. He became a deacon (1802), and priest (1804), prebendary of Durham (1809), dean of Chester (1828), and bishop of Exeter (1830). He was the recognized head of the High-church party, and, in the House of Lords, was upon the extreme Tory side, opposing every kind of liberal measure. He was also involved in several memorable controversies, especially with the Roman Catholic historians, John Lingard (q.v.; 1806) and Charles Butler (1822). But he is best known by the Gorham Case (q.v.). On the reversal of the lower courts' decision by the privy council, he published *A Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury* (London and New York, 1850), in which he threatened to hold no communion with the archbishop.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Of the *Life* by R. N. Shutte only vol. i. appeared, London, 1863. Consult: H. P. Liddon, *Life of . . . Pusey*, 4 vols., London, 1893–97; *DNB*, xlv. 222–225.

PHILO OF ALEXANDRIA.

I. Life.
II. Works.
Lost and Spurious (§ 1).
Exegetical (§ 2).
Philosophical and Political (§ 3).
III. Doctrines.
Relation and Scope (§ 1).
On God in Himself (§ 2).
God Revealed; Creation (§ 3).
Intermediate Potencies; the Logos (§ 4).
Man (§ 5).
The Scriptures (§ 6).
Ethics (§ 7).
Eschatology (§ 8).
IV. Later Influence.

I. Life: Philo of Alexandria (b. about 20 B.C.; d. about 42 A.D.) stands as the leading exponent of the Jewish-Alexandrine religious philosophy, and in its influence upon the literature of the Christian Church its foremost representative. The incomplete biography of him is derived from statements in his own works and from incidental passages in Josephus (*Ant.*, XVIII., viii. 1, XX., v. 2), Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.*, ii. 4–5; Eng. transl., *NPNF*, 2 ser., i. 107–109; *Præparatio evangelica*, viii. 13–14; Eng. transl., 2 vols., Oxford, 1903), Jerome (*De vir. ill.*, xi.), Isidore of Pelusium, Photius, and Suidas. From these it appears that Philo was of a rich, prominent family, brother of Alexander Lysimachus, alabarch of the Jews at Alexandria. Whether he was of priestly descent (Jerome) and whether his name was Jedediah or this was merely a free rendering of the name Philo by later Jewish writers remain uncertain. In 39 or 40 A.D. he appeared as the representative of the Jews of Alexandria

before Caligula at Rome to regain the privileges lost through the acts of the imperial governor Publius Avilius Flaccus in conjunction with the bloody atrocities of the hostile Greek party. The mission secured no promise of relief; but the accession of Claudius brought the restoration of their rights and the release of their imprisoned alabarch; and under Claudius, Philo wrote the report of the expedition to Rome. At what time he sojourned in Palestine is uncertain.

II. Works: Of his works, Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.*, ii. 18; Eng. transl., ut sup., 119–122) gives a fair but incomplete enumeration; but some of the writings mentioned thus, as well as others in the later accounts of Jerome, Photius, and Suidas, are extant, if at all, in fragments only. All but meager fragments is lost of the important work "Counsels for the Jews," no doubt identical with the "Apology for the Jews" mentioned by Eusebius; likewise three books of "Questions and Answers on Exodus," two books of the "Allegory of the Sacred Laws," one book of "On Rewards," and the same of "On Numbers." Peter Alexius refuted the charge brought by a forgotten Socinian theologian of the seventeenth century that a Christian author toward the close of the second century composed the collective writings of Philo and ascribed them to him. This untenable hypothesis was taken up in the last century by a hypercritic of Jewish descent, Kirschbaum by name, who assumed, however, a gigantic fraud by several Christian authors. More consideration is due to recent attacks on individual works; such as, for instance, against the apparent composite character of *De incorruptibilitate mundi*, against the "Dissertations on Samson and Jonah" from the Armenian, the *Interpretatio Hebraicorum nominum*, and the *Liber antiquitatum Biblicarum* printed in the sixteenth century in Philo's name. The last three are certainly not genuine. Weighty objections have been raised by recent critics against the authenticity of *De vita contemplativa*, some of whom claim its origin to have been from the monk Falsarius at the close of the third century; because (1) of its connection with the writing *Quod omnis probus liber* of which it is claimed to be a continuation; (2) the author is more limited in his cosmic view than Philo and has in mind the monastic mode of thought; and (3) it was never mentioned before Eusebius, who seeks to establish thereby the historical priority of the Therapeutæ (q.v.). However, this argument makes too much of the silence before Eusebius; besides, the diction is decidedly of the period of Philo, and the descent of the manuscript as well as the Jewish character of its contents speak also for its authenticity.

1. Lost and Spurious.

The genuine or unquestioned works of Philo fall into three groups: the exegetical on the Pentateuch, the philosophical, and the political. The exegetical is the most replete and comprehensive and is subdivided as to contents into the cosmogonical, historical, and legislative writings. Of the cosmogonical, *De mundi opificio* is an allegorical explanation of the creation in Genesis. The historical writings, called also allegorical or genealogical, present a historico-allegorical elucidation of Genesis chapter by chapter. Those of legislative content present ethical considerations with reference to the decalogue and Hebrew ritual based on the codes in Exodus, Leviticus, and Deuteronomy.

2. Exegetical

The philosophical works belonging to Philo's earlier period and challenged by the modern critics on account of difference of content with that of the later works are, *De incorruptibilitate mundi; Quod omnis probus liber;* and *De vita contemplativa.* To these belong the *Quæstiones et solutiones in Genesin et Exodum*, a brief catechetical explanation of the Pentateuch originally in five books, partly preserved in a Latin translation and partly recovered in an Armenian translation; and, from the Armenian, *De providentia* (2 books); and *Alexander seu de ratione brutorum.* The political or historico-apologetical writings for the cultured class of Jews and heathen in common, with an apologetical tendency in favor of the first, embrace, *De vita Mosis;* the "Counsels for the Jews"; "Unto Flaccus"; and "Embassy to Gaius" [Caligula], the last two important for autobiographical notices, and forming books iii. and iv. respectively of a more comprehensive work of five books, "On the Fate of the Jews under Emperor Gaius," the fourth and fifth of which bore the common title, "On the Virtues."

2. Philosophical and Political.

III. Doctrines: Philo stands as the most conspicuous figure and the culminating point of a long development marked by the confluence of Jewish monotheism and Hellenic cosmogony. This movement is represented at Alexandria in the middle of the third century before Christ by the peripatetic Aristobulus, who already shows the tendency of allegorizing and of abstracting the conception of deity from Biblical anthropomorphism by the intrusion of intermediate entities. The allegorizing of Philo is said to have gathered up into a mighty basin all the streams of Alexandrine hermeneutics from the past and discharged them again into multiple streams and rivulets of the later exegesis of Judaism and Christianity. He knew all the important Greek philosophers, from whom he cited freely; but first for him was Plato, from whom he derived his philosophical content, while in his method of extravagant allegorizing he imitated the Stoics. These allegorized the Greek myths in the effort to philosophize the multiple forms of popular religion and reduce them to simple fundamental principles; so did Philo in dealing with the Biblical and legal forms and cultic prescriptions of the Jews, in the interest, however, of monotheism. In his adherence to a living personal Creator and Ruler of the universe, revealed through Moses, and choosing Israel from the world races as his peculiar possession, he did not waver. Moses to him is the prophet of all prophets and his law the essence of all wisdom and doctrine of virtue; and waiving his privilege of constructing an independent cosmology he presents his cosmological views in the form of a great practico-speculative commentary on the Pentateuch. He disapproves of the heretical sects of Judaism, and lavishes warm praise on the pious Essenes. The

1. Relation and Scope.

emphasis of Philo is positive; faith and piety are the supreme virtues. His positive faith is saturated with an ardent mysticism; not that of absorption in divine contemplation, but rather that sustained on the one hand throughout his monotheistic ethical point of view and on the other throughout his philosophical consciousness, ever alert to penetrate to the nature of things. Philo was thus the first monotheistic theologian in this cosmopolitan sense and the predecessor of the Alexandrine school.

2. On God in Himself.

In his doctrine of God he distinguished strictly between God in himself and God revealed, as demanded by his Old-Testament theistic point of view as well as his Platonic dualism of spirit and matter. On the one hand, he rejects the pantheistic view and the deification of creatures; on the other, the anthropomorphic and anthropopathic view. God in himself is absolute, incorporate, and outside of the material universe; comprehending all, yet uncomprehended. He is outside of time and space, and in his being unknowable. The only name by which God can be designated is therefore pure being (*to on* or *ho ōn*). Though without real attributes yet in contrast with created being certain marks can not be avoided, such as immutability, unity, simplicity, absolute freedom, and beatitude, without lack of anything, self-sufficiency, whereby he stands in relation to nothing and is none of the created beings. God is called " the Good " only in the sense that he is the source of all good; " Light," in the figurative, only as the divine source, as much brighter than the visible lights as the sun exceeds the darkness.

3. God Revealed; Creation.

God, as revealed, on the other hand, is also immanent in his relation with the universe and is the all-filling, all-penetrating, leaving no vacuum. He is the author of the universe and first cause on whom depends the world of spirits and sense. A series of attributes arise from his relations with the universe; such as omnipotence, by virtue of which he is almighty and the efficient cause of all; omniscience, all-knowing the present and all-foreseeing the future; and wisdom, whereby he transcends the counsel and reason of mankind. Three corollaries follow his creative power: the material, the means, and the object. (1) The stuff was the matter (*hylē*), the relative nothing (*me on*). Time is evolved from formless matter; and, not in time but with time becoming, heaven and earth were created. Creation in six days is to be taken figuratively, six being a symbol of perfection and representing the relative order and not time. This conception of creation taken from the *Timæus* of Plato is fundamentally nothing else than the absolute rational plan of creation springing from the Logos of God (cf. Origen and Origenistic Controversies). This Logos is the means by which the universe was created and the object was God's beneficence as love and as free self-impartation to his creatures.

Between God the Infinite and the finite, imperfect universe there is a wide gap which is, however, removed by being filled with divine potencies (*dynameis*), which are peculiar mediating beings or concepts, represented on the one hand as active powers, self-revelations, or attributes of God; on the other, as personal beings of a spiritual kind.

4. Intermediate Potencies; the Logos.

Incomprehensible in number they submit to classification; namely, into the well-doing and the primitive powers. At the head of the former is the *agathotes* through whom God made the universe and at the head of the other is the *archē*, through whom he rules it. But higher than these two at the summit of the series of all mediate beings, constituting their principle of unity, appears the divine Logos. He is their father and leader, the first-born. Are the others angels, he is the archangel. He stands in immanent relation with God and proceeds from him, whereas the others proceed from the Logos. He is sometimes called second God or image of God; his administrator, tool, and mediator. As mediator, through him the world was made. In him subsisted at the beginning of creation heaven and earth; i.e., the body of ideals. He is the seat of ideals which by partition or separation he projects from himself. Through him God imprints the intermediate potencies, which have their seat in the Logos, upon matter; hence his is called " seal of God." As the bond of unity, God holds together, supports, and directs all through him. He is also represented as the high-priest and advocate for men with God. The synonym " word " (*hrēma ;* Gen. i. 3; Ps. xxxiii. 6; Deut. viii. 3) used sometimes by Philo indicates that the Logos was to him equivalent to the Biblical term of the Old-Testament instrument of creation and governance of the world.

5. Man.

At the conclusion of the work of creation, God made first the heavenly man through the Logos; i.e., the preexistent ideal man, in his pretemporal, spiritual, unsexual eternal state, untainted by sin and truly in the divine image. Subsequently, the earthly man, made not by the Logos alone but with the aid of the lower potencies, was deficient in the perfect image of God and was, in advance, subject to the possibility of sinning. Indeed, his higher soul (*nous*) came from the creative, living breath of God, but in the creation of his lower soul (with its earthly reason, *nous geïnós*) as well as his body, several angelic potencies or demiurges cooperated. After the earthly man had lived seven years in Paradise, or the realm of virtues, especially of piety and wisdom, he was sexually differentiated by the formation of woman from him and he entered the state of temptation and sin. The results of the fall are partly physical and partly ethical, the latter being the increasing degeneration of Adam's descendants, impure from birth. A partial image of God remains as freedom of will and rational perception; by these the fallen retain unbroken connection with God, particularly through the Logos through whom God reveals himself. Many men fail to apprehend God because of their guilt; only the consecrated who know how to rise above the earthly may enter into closer relations with him. In the special Scripture revelation, Moses is the earthly mediator of a revelation which shows Israel to be the chosen and the possessed of God, just as the Logos is the heavenly mediator.

The Scriptures—Philo having in mind the Septuagint— are capable of a double sense, and must not be understood otherwise than as allegorical. The immediate sense is the literal, fit only for weaker minds; it is the outer integument which the mediate or allegorical sense penetrates and fills as the soul does the body. The formal criteria for preferring the allegorical are, (1) when the literal represents something unworthy of God; (2) when there is apparent contradiction; and (3) when the text itself is figurative. In a series of instances a deeper sense is implied, (1) by a duplication of expression; (2) a redundant word or words; (3) repetition with slight variation; and (4) play of words and the like.

6. The Scriptures.

In the doctrine of the moral law Philo stands on strict monotheistic, Old-Testament ground; in the doctrine of virtue he adheres to Plato and the Stoics. The divine moral law appears to him the entire natural and moral, world-comprehending order. The law of Moses is the visible transcript of the natural law. The Hebrew ceremonial law requires in all points a spiritual or allegorical interpretation. The virtues are arranged in the order of importance according to the Platonic-Stoic scheme, with the exception that piety is supreme. The strict ascetic retirement of the Therapeutæ and Essenes is commended for the culture of the virtues. The Logos is given an important place in the ethical sphere, as the teacher of virtues, the conqueror of evils, and the heavenly model for men. He operates on the one hand in the human conscience as judge; on the other, as mediator before God for man.

7. Ethics.

In his doctrine on immortality and retribution, so far as it affects the individual, Philo stands on Hellenic ground; in his expectation for the future of the people of God, he is Jewish particularist. Man is designed to be immortal by virtue of his godlike nature. Actual immortality is attained through virtue, especially piety; also by philosophy, apprehended and realized in life. Though the life of the sinner continues after death, yet it is not really immortal; this property belongs to those only who carry their blessedness attained in this world into the highest ether of the world beyond, where they behold God. The fate of the godless is that the punishment which sin carries within itself in this world, such as fear, sadness, and strife, continues into the next. The misery involved in sin is the place of its condemnation and not the mythical Hades. Philo knows nothing of a trans-mundane hell as a place for torment, the devil, or malevolent angels.

8. Eschatology.

IV. Later Influence: Philo's religious philosophy exerted a profound influence upon the early Christian theology and the development of Christianity. It has been termed " an outline of the kernel of Christian history formed by the Jew Philo before it went into effect," and the Logos doctrine has been called " the Jewish prologue of Christianity." But such generalizations can be supported only so far as the coincidences of individual concepts and expressions of Philo with those of the New Testament and some of the early Christian writers. The teachings of Philo differ as much as possible from the fundamental doctrines of Christianity regarding the person and work of Christ. In his treatment of messianic prophecies of the Old Testament he either preoccupies himself with abstractly spiritualistic allegory or with a one-sided national hope, stopping short of a deeper ethical interpretation. His Logos doctrine is one only in name with that of the New Testament; the former is a cosmic potency without true personal character, the latter is above all else a personal being of ethical godlike significance. The former is unrelated to the theocratic national expectations of Israel; the latter is the incarnate Son of the Father, the Messiah. However, this is not equally true of the influence of Philo upon the formal dogma and exegesis of the Fathers, which were both far-reaching and persistent. As already upon Josephus and upon the later exegetes of the Targum and the Midrash, the Cabalists, and the religious philosophers of the Middle Ages; so the influence of Philo's phraseology and allegorical exegesis shows itself upon a considerable number of the early Christian writers, particularly of the Alexandrian school; and even in a certain sense upon New-Testament writers like Paul, John, and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Of the Greek Fathers, especially Barnabas, Justin, Theophilus of Antioch, Clement, Origen, Eusebius, and, among the Latins, Ambrose and Jerome, show a similar influence. (O. Zöckler†.)

Bibliography: The best ed. of the " Works " is by L. Cohn and P. Wendland, in an *editio major* and *minor*, vols. i.–v. and ix., Berlin, 1896–1909. There is also an *editio stereotypa* in course of issue from Leipsic, vols. i., v., vi., 1898–1905; The *editio princeps* by A. Turnebus was issued Paris, 1552; an edition which has long been standard is that by T. Mangey, 2 vols., London, 1742. There is an Eng. transl. by C. D. Yonge, 4 vols., London, 1854–55; and a new Germ. transl. was begun under the editorship of L. Cohn, vol. i., Breslau, 1909. Special mention should be made of *Neu entdeckte Fragmenta Philos*, ed. P Wendland, Berlin, 1891; *Fragments of Philo Judæus*, newly ed., J. R. Harris, Cambridge, 1886; and the Eng. transl., *Philo about the Contemplative Life*, by F. C. Conybeare, Oxford, 1895 (contains a full bibliography). Very useful as covering the whole subject are: *DCB*, iv. 357–388 (a notable discussion); Schürer, *Geschichte*, iii. 487–562, Eng. transl., II., iii. 321–381; *DB*, extra vol., pp. 197–208; and Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire*, fasc. xxxi., cols. 300–312. Consult further: J. Bryant, *The Sentiment of Philo Judæus*, London, 1798; C. G. L. Grossmann, *Quæstiones Philoneæ*, part 1, *De theologiæ Philonis fontibus et auctoritate*, Leipsic, 1829; A. Gfrörer, *Philon und die alexandrinische Theosophie*, Stuttgart, 1831; A. F. Dähne, *Geschichtliche Darstellung der jüdisch-alexandrinischen Religionsphilosophie*, 2 vols., Halle, 1834; F. Keferstein, *Philo's Lehre vom den göttlichen Mittelwesen*, Leipsic, 1846; J. Bucher, *Philonische Studien*, Tübingen, 1848; C. Morgan, *An Investigation of the Trinity of Plato and Philo*, London, 1853; J. T. Delaunay, *Philon d'Alexandrie*, Paris, 1867; M. Heinze, *Lehre vom Logos*, Leipsic, 1872; B. Bruno, *Philo, Strauss und Renan, und das Urchristenthum*, Berlin, 1874; J. W. Lake, *Plato, Philo and Paul; or the pagan Conception of a " Divine Logos " the Basis of the Christian Dogma*, Edinburgh, 1874; C. Siegfried, *Philon von Alexandrien als Ausleger des Alten Testaments*, Jena, 1875; H. Soulier, *La doctrine du logos chez Philon d'Alexandrie*, Turin, 1876; F. Klasen, *Die alttestamentliche Weisheit und der Logos der jüdisch-alexandrinischen Philosophie*, Freiburg, 1878; J. Réville, *Le Logos d'après Philon d'Alexandrie*, Geneva, 1877; P. E. Lucius, *Die Therapeuten Eine kritische Untersuchung der Schrift " De vita contemplativa,"* Strasburg, 1879; J. Réville, *La Doctrine du logos dans le quatrième evangile et dans les œuvres de Philon*, Paris, 1881; S. Weiss, *Philo von Alexandrien und Moses Maimonides*, Halle, 1884; J. Drummond, *Philo*

Judæus, or the Jewish-Alexandrian Philosophy in its Development and Completion, 2 vols., London, 1888; H. von Arnim, *Quellenstudien zu Philo von Alexandrien*, Berlin, 1888; L. Massebieau, *Le Classement des œuvres de Philon*, Paris, 1889; M. Freudenthal, *Die Erkenntnisslehre Philos von Alexandria*, Berlin, 1891; P. Wendland and O. Kern, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der griechischen Philosophie und Religion*, pp. 1–75, Berlin, 1895; C. G. Montefiore, in *JQR*, vii (1895), 481–545 (a florilegium); A. Aall, *Geschichte der Logosidee in der griechischen Philosophie*, 2 parts, Leipsic, 1896–99; E. Herriot, *Philon le juif*, Paris, 1898; S. Tiktin, *Die Lehre von den Tugenden und Pflichten bei Philo*, Bern, 1898; T. Simon, *Der Logos*, Leipsic, 1902; W. Bousset, *Die Religion des Judenthums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*, Berlin, 1903; P. Krüger, *Philo und Josephus als Apologeten des Judenthums*, Leipsic, 1906; J. Martin, *Philon*, Paris, 1907; P. Heinisch, *Der Einfluss Philos auf die älteste christliche Exegese*, in *Altestamentliche Abhandlungen*, ed. J. Nikel, Münster, 1908; *Les Idées philosophiques et religieuses de Philon d' Alexandrie*, Paris, 1908; K. S. Guthrie, *The Message of Philo-Judæus of Alexandria*, Chicago, 1909; H. Windisch, *Die Frömmigkeit Philos und ihre Bedeutung für das Christenthum*, Leipsic, 1909; N. Bentwich, *Philo-Judæus of Alexandria*, Philadelphia, 1910; K. S. Guthrie, *The Message of Philo Judæus of Alexandria*, London, 1910; works on the history of Israel, e.g., H. Ewald, *Geschichte*, vi. 257–312, and on the history of philosophy.

PHILO BYBLIUS (HERENNIUS PHILO): Greek grammarian and historian; b. in 63 A.D. (not 42, as was usually given); d. after 141. Knowledge of him comes principally through Suidas, though he is mentioned not infrequently by the Church Fathers, particularly by Origen (*Contra Celsum*, i. 15; Eng. transl., *ANF*, iv. 403) and Eusebius (*Præparatio Evangelica*, i. 9–10; Eng. transl., 2 vols., Oxford, 1903). Suidas makes him an ambassador to Rome in the time of Hadrian, and a friend of Herennius Severus (from whom he took his name Herennius), consul in 141 A.D. Three of the many works ascribed to him are often referred to: "Concerning Cities and the Famous Men they have produced," "Phenician History" or "Things Phenician" (a professed translation of a work by Sanchuniathon, q.v.); and "Concerning Jews," about which it is debated whether it was an independent work or merely an excursus to or a chapter in the "Phenician History," with the probability inclining in favor of the former alternative. The quotations from his "Phenician History" are supposed to make him out to be a Euhemerist; but it is to be remembered that if this work is really a translation from the putative author, Sanchuniathon, Philo can not be held responsible for the trend of opinion there expressed. Only fragments remain of his works in citations by Eusebius.

GEO. W. GILMORE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The fragments are collected in C. and T. Muller, *Fragmenta historicorum Græcorum*, iii. 560–576, 4 vols., Paris, 1841–51. Consult H. Ewald, in the *Abhandlungen* of the Royal Society of Göttingen, v (1853); E. Renan, in the *Mémoires* of the Academy of Inscriptions, xxiii. 2 (1858), 241 sqq.; W. von Baudissin, *Studien zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte*, i. 3 sqq., Leipsic, 1878; Schürer, *Geschichte*, and Eng. transl., Introduction, §§ 3, 18; and literature under SANCHUNIATHON.

PHILO OF CARPASIA: Bishop who flourished in the fourth century. Polybius in his fanciful *Vita Epiphanii* (*MPG*, xli. 85) writes of a deacon Philo whom among others the sister of Honorius and Arcadius sent to Cyprus to Epiphanius to summon him to Rome to cure her of sickness by the laying on of hands and prayer. But Philo on account of his piety was consecrated by Epiphanius as bishop of Carpasia, Cyprus, and was entrusted with the former's official administration during his absence at Rome. With this has been combined the notice of Suidas that "Philo the Carpathian wrote a commentary on the Song of Songs"; but Carpathos is the name of an island between Rhodes and Crete. Here there is either reference to different persons or a confusion of places; probably the latter, since the commentary mentioned by Suidas, preserved in a number of manuscripts, is provided with the superscription, "Commentary on the Song of Songs of Philo, bishop of Carpasia." The commentary was first published by A. Giacomelli (Rome, 1772); was printed by A. Gallandius, *Bibliotheca veterum patrum*, vol. ix. Appendix, p. 713 (Venice, 1765–1781); and is in *MPG*, xl. 1 sqq. (A. HAUCK.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Fabricius-Harles, *Bibliotheca Græca*, ix. 252, Hamburg, 1804; O. Bardenhewer, *Patrologie*, p. 276, Freiburg, 1901, Eng. transl., St. Louis, 1908.

PHILOPATRIS, fī''lo-pē'tris: A dialogue ascribed by a single family of manuscripts to the Greek satirist Lucian. Formerly regarded as a satire on Christianity, it is now known to be a political pamphlet of the Byzantine period. It is divided into two parts: the first is theological and contains a refutation of heathen polytheism accompanied by an exposition of Christian doctrine; the second is political and reveals the dissatisfaction felt in certain circles with the government of that period, though it closes with expressions of loyalty, and with the hope that the emperor would overcome his enemies.

The Humanist editors of Lucian themselves perceived that this dialogue, which is inartistic both in form and execution, was not written by their author; and this view is undoubtedly correct, although naturally there have been some defenders of its authenticity, the latest of whom was C. G. Kelle, *Luciani Philopatris* (Leipsic, 1826). Some classicists sought at least to maintain that the dialogue was written in the time of Trajan, but the majority of critics allowed themselves to be influenced by J. M. Gesner (*De ætate et auctore dialogi qui Philopatris inscribitur*, Jena, 1714) in favor of the period of Julian. A. von Gutschmid and others were inclined to refer the work to the time of the Persian wars of Heraclius. At present, however, the general opinion is in harmony with the view of B. G. Niebuhr, to the effect that the dialogue belongs to the second half of the tenth century, the time of Nicephorus Phocas (963–969) or to that of his successor, John Tzimiskes (969–976). If this be true, the whole first part must be regarded as a jesting religious controversy, introduced to give plausibility to the attribution of the dialogue to Lucian; although R. Crampe has argued that, if the work was written in the seventh century, political opposition would be combined with a tendency toward paganism.

The dialogue was expunged from the Aldine edition of Lucian of 1522 by the Inquisition, and was placed on the Index by Paul V. in 1559. To whatever period it may be assigned, the *Philopatris* retains its interest from a theological point of view because of its combination of Christian ideas with

Lucianic style, whether it proves the existence of paganism in Byzantium in the seventh century, or whether it simply shows how frivolously the Humanists of the tenth century treated questions of faith. The description of Paul borrowed from the Acts of Paul and Thecla and the allusion to II Cor. xii. 2 sqq. are also worthy of note. E. von Dobschütz.

Bibliography: The work is printed in the eds. of Lucian's "Works" of Florence, 1496, the Aldine, 1503 (expunged in that of 1522), Zweibrücken, 1791, and Leipsic, 1839. Separate issues are by J. M. Gesner, Jena, 1715; C. B. Hase, in *Leo Diaconus, CSHB*, Bonn, 1828. Consult: Fabricius-Harles, *Bibliotheca Græca*, v. 344, Hamburg, 1796; Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, pp. 459 sqq.; idem, in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, xi (1902), 578 sqq.; B. G. Niebuhr, *Ueber das Alter des Dialogs Philopatris*, Bonn, 1843; R. Crampe, *Philopatris*, Halle, 1894; E. Rohde, in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, v (1895), 1–15, vi (1896), 475–482; C. Stach, *De Philopatride*, Cracow, 1897; R. Garnett, *Alms for Oblivion*, in *Cornhill Magazine*, May, 1901; S. Reinach, *La Question du Philopatris*, in *Revue archéologique*, 1902, 79–110.

PHILOPONUS. See Johannes Philoponus.

PHILOSTORGIUS, fil″o-stor′jius: Arian controversialist; b. at Borissus in Cappadocia about 364; d. after 425. His father was the strict Arian Carterius, and he became a polemical writer in the same cause. At the age of twenty he repaired to Constantinople for study and met Eunomius on the way, whose works he studied. There is no further knowledge of the course of his life. The work for which he was famous was a church history in twelve books, intended to justify the Arian party and is unfortunately lost. Only excerpts by Photius and others who used it have come down, and these are unreliable except as they report mere facts. It is certain that he used the writings of Aëtius and Eunomius and Arian documents as well as the history of Eusebius. The history began with the controversy between Arius and Alexander and extended to Valentinian III. It would scarcely be reliable in its partizan representation of persons and relations, yet the loss of so much historical matter dealing with an age so intensely controversial is to be deplored. The work was used and read during the Middle Ages; the excerpts of Photius are mentioned, Suidas used it for his lexicon, Nicetes Akominatus possessed it, and Nicephorus seems to have used it. (Erwin Preuschen.)

Bibliography: The first issue of the excerpts of Photius, ed. J. Gothofredus, was at Geneva, 1643; Valesius edited them next, Paris, 1673, after which there were several editions, principally the one by W. Reading, Cambridge, 1720, reprinted at Turin, 1748, and in *MPG*, lxv. New fragments were edited by P. Batiffol in *Römische Quartalschrift*, iii (1889), 134 sqq., cf. his *Quæstiones Philostoggianæ*, Paris, 1891, and his articles in the *Quartalschrift*, iv (1890), 134 sqq., ix (1895), 57 sqq. An Eng. transl. is by Walford, London, 1855. Consult: Fabricius-Harles, *Bibliotheca Græca*, vii. 509 sqq., Hamburg, 1801; J. R. Asmus, in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, iv. 30 sqq.; L. Jeep, in *Rheinisches Museum*, lii (1897), 213 sqq.; *TU*, xvii (1899); Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, viii. 509–514; *DCB*, iv. 390; and the literature under Arianism.

PHILOXENUS, fī-lox′i-nus, **(XENAIA, AXENAIA):** Monophysite bishop of Mabug (Hierapolis); said to have been born at Tahal, a little place in the Persian district of Beth-Garmai, between the Tigris and the mountains of Kurdistan, in the second quarter of the fifth century; d. a violent death at Gangra in Paphlagonia, probably 523. He was probably of Syrian parentage, and not a slave, as was reported by Theodore the Lector; studied at Edessa while Ibas was bishop there (435–457), but was an opponent of Ibas and of Nestorianism. He left Edessa and went to Antioch, where, having accepted the Henoticon (q.v.), he came into conflict with the Patriarch Calandio, who expelled him; but he returned and was by Peter Fullo (458) consecrated metropolitan of Hierapolis (Mabug), when he took the name Philoxenus, sending a confession of his faith to the Emperor Xenos, to refute a charge of Eutychianism (q.v.). For the next thirteen years nothing is heard of him. It is not impossible that this was the period when the writings which made him famous were composed. In May, 498, he was in Edessa, being charged with undue leniency toward drunken carnival rioters. With the accession to office of Flavian in 498 (see Monophysites) Philoxenus came more into publicity as the spokesman of the Monophysites. He was twice at Constantinople, being summoned thither by Anastasius in 506 at the end of the Persian war. He was the animating spirit of the party which assailed Flavian as a Nestorian. At the Synod of Tyre Monophysitism was victorious; but a few years later came the reversal, and under Justin (successor of Anastasius) Philoxenus was banished to Philippopolis (518 or 519), and then to Gangra.

The eminent position and ability of Philoxenus as a writer are conceded. His productions stamp him as a man of virile thought, strong will, and warm heart, while the "strife-secking rioter" his opponents deemed him disappears in the spiritual curate of souls. Jacob of Edessa (q.v.) regarded him as one of the four great teachers of the Syrian church, Ephraem, Jacob of Sarug, and Isaac of Antioch being the others. He was held in equal estimation by the Armenians, who quoted and used his writings. Numerous manuscripts of his writings exist at Paris, Rome, Oxford, and particularly at the British Museum, but comparatively few have been published. For his work on Bible translation see Bible Versions, A, III., 2. He wrote a partial commentary on the Gospels, and dealt with dogmatic subjects, liturgics, and the like, and a list of eighty writings is given by Budge (see below). Among the printed productions are thirteen addresses on the Christian life, dogmatic treatises on matters dealing with a personal creed; on the Chalcedonian creed; against Nestorius and Nestorianism; letters of theological content to Abraham and Orestes, priests at Edessa, on the pantheism of Stephen bar Sudaili to the monks at Teleda (between Antioch and Aleppo); circular addresses to monks, with no particular ascription; letters to monks at Beth Gaugal near Amida, and to Emperor Zeno; and two Anaphora, printed in E. Renaudot, *Liturgiarum orientalium collectio*, ii. 370 (Paris, 1716).

In considering his Christology, it is to be borne in mind that he stood for the same thing as Severus of Antioch (q.v.), with whom he fought shoulder to shoulder, the two being the foremost representatives of Monophysitism, ever energetically opposed to Eutychianism (q.v.) and Apollinarianism (see Apol-

LINARIS OF LAODICEA). His letter to Zeno issued from a desire to purge himself of false suspicion. "He who was complete deity assumed flesh and became true man," he asserts in this letter. While the polemic against Nestorius gradually lost its interest, the effort continued to guard against the consequences of Docetism (q.v.), and appears in the latest of his writings—to the monks of Teleda. In this the avowal of the reality of the manhood of Christ and of his undergoing the experiences of humanity is explicit. Philoxenus emphasized the fact that all which Christ did was done both voluntarily and vicariously. In the last phases of his thought he approached the position of Julian of Halicarnassus (q.v.). Yet it must remain a matter of doubt whether Philoxenus had part in the strife between Julian and Severus, since this broke out while Philoxenus was in banishment in Thrace, though Severus expressly stated that Julian had not only published his book in Alexandria but had distributed it broadcast. Possibly Philoxenus had received it, in whose earlier writings Severus "had found nothing foolish." The letter to the monks of Teleda and a work of unassigned authorship appear to be the only documents which contain an echo of the dispute.

Early issue of some of his works is to be found in S. E. Assemani, *Bibliotheca orientalis* (Rome, 1719–1728); and M. Le Quien, *Oriens Christianus* (Paris, 1740). Later issues are: *The Discourses of Philoxenus, Bishop of Mabbogh A.D. 485–519, Edited from Syriac Manuscripts with an English Translation by E. A. Wallis Budge*, 2 vols. (London, 1894); *Three Letters of Philoxenus, Bishop of Mabbogh (485–519): being the Letter to the Monks, the first Letter to the Monks of Beth-Gaugal, and the Letter to the Emperor Zeno with an English Translation, and Introduction,* by A. A. Vaschalde (Rome, 1902); the *Letter of Mar Xenaias of Mabug to Abraham and Orestes*, in A. L. Frothingham's *Stephen bar Sudaili* (Leyden, 1886); and his *Tractatus tres de trinitate et incarnatione*, ed. A. Vaschalde, in *CSCO*, vol. xxvii., 1907. (G. KRÜGER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The early sources are for the most part collected, abstracted, or used in J. S. Assemani, *Bibliotheca orientalis*, i. 268, 346–358, 475, 479, ii. 10, 13, 17, 20. Consult further: W Wright, *Short Hist. of Syriac Literature*, pp. 72–76, London, 1894; idem, *Catalogue of Syriac MSS. in the British Museum*, 3 parts, London, 1870–72; R. Duval, *Hist. politique, religieuse et littéraire d'Edesse*, Paris, 1892; idem, *La Littérature syriaque*, ib. 1900; E. Ter-Minassiantz, in *TU*, xxvi (1904); *DCB*, iv. 391–393.

PHOCAS, SAINT: Christian martyr. He is said to have been a gardener at Sinope in Pontus where he was famous for his lavish almsgiving and hospitality to strangers. He suffered martyrdom, as some hold, in the persecution under Trajan (98–117); according to others, under Diocletian (284–305). In the East he is the patron saint of mariners, who are accustomed to revere him with hymns, call upon him when in distress at sea, and share with him a part of their profits by giving them to the poor. A magnificent church was erected to his honor at Constantinople by the emperor of the same name shortly before 610. The Phocas revered by Roman tradition as the bishop of Sinope must be the same person. Another Phocas must be a martyr of Antioch, a touch of the door of whose tomb, according to Gregory of Tours, was a cure for serpent bites. (O. ZÖCKLER†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The *Acta*, by Bishop Asterius, are in *ASB*, Sept., vi. 293–299; in F. Combefis, *Græco-Lat. patrum bibliothecæ novum auctarium*, i. 169–182, Paris, 1648; and L. Surius, *Vitæ sanctorum*, Sept., 22, 12 vols., Cologne, 1617–18. The anonymous *Martyrium S. Phocæ martyris et episcopi Sinope in Ponto*, is in *ASB*, July, iii. 639–645. The *Vita* of Phocas the martyr of Antioch is in *ASB*, Mar., i. 366–367, and in Surius, ut sup., Mar., 5. Consult *DCB*, iv. 393–394.

PHŒBADIUS, fî-bê'di-ŭs (**FŒGADIUS, FITADIUS**): Bishop of Aginnum, the modern Agen (73 m. s.e. of Bordeaux); d. after 392. He skilfully confuted the second Sirmian formula (see ARIANISM, I., iii., § 6) in southern Gaul by means of western orthodoxy, in his work *Liber contra Arianos* (in the latter part of 357 or in 358; *MPL*, xx. 13–20), a work clear, animated, and occasionally ironical in argument and admirable and impressive in style. The main thought is that if Christ is not God he is not real Son. Known after the beginning of the sixteenth century is a tract, *De fide orthodoxa contra Arianos* (*MPL*, xx. 31–50) with an attached confession of faith, with which Phœbadius has been generally credited. At the Synod of Rimini in 359, Phœbadius obstinately defended orthodoxy, but finally with Servatio of Tongern was made to yield. These two bishops at a certain stage of the synod produced special formulas, "in which first Arius and all his unbelief are condemned, and secondly, the Son of God is not only pronounced to be equal with the Father but also without beginning." Phœbadius took part in the synods of Valence and Saragossa (380), and was still living in 392.

(EDGAR HENNECKE.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: K. Schönemann, *Bibliotheca patrum Latinorum*, i. 309–312, Leipsic, 1792; Tillemont, *Mémoires*, vi. 427–428; *Gallia Christiana*, ii (1720), 895–897; J. Dräseke, in *ZWT*, 1890, pp. 78–98; F. W. F. Kattenbusch, *Das apostolische Symbol*, i. 171–173, Leipsic, 1894; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, v. 372–377; *DCB*, ii. 547 (under "Fœgadius").

PHOTINUS, fō'ti-nŭs: Bishop of Sirmium; b. in Ancyra in Galatia; d. in Galatia 376. He was a pupil of Marcellus of Ancyra and bishop of Sirmium in Pannonia, near the modern Mitrovicza. He first appears at the Synod of Antioch in 344, where the Eastern Church condemned him and Marcellus. This judgment was approved by a Synod at Milan in 345, and Photinus was deprived of his bishopric by a Synod of Sirmium in 351. According to Epiphanius he appealed to the Emperor Constantius, was granted a hearing, and disputed with Basil of Ancyra before his judges. Socrates and Sozomen correctly refer this disputation to the Synod of Sirmium in 351, and state that he was exiled. The Synod of Milan, 355, renewed the anathema. That he returned for a season appears from the friendly letter of Emperor Julian to him and from the fact that Jerome knows him to have been banished by Valentinian (364–375). His heresy obtained little influence in the East; but in the West, especially on the Balkan peninsula, Photinians continued for a longer period. They were known at Sirmium in 381, and at the beginning of the fifth century a Photinian Marcus, driven from Rome, found refuge in the diocese of Senia, Dalmatia. Augustine refers

to them frequently not as a sect but as persons in general who think after the Photinian manner; i.e., persons who regard Christ as a mere man.

Photinus was a dynamic monarchian (see MONARCHIANISM) who, without denying the virgin birth, regarded the person of Christ as essentially human; and denied a hypostatic distinction of the Logos from the Father and a hypostasis of the Spirit. He attached himself to the Marcellian doctrine and argumentation: " the Son is known simply according to his appearance in the flesh " and Daniel (vii. 13) speaks " prophetically, not as of the Son existing." His most significant writings, according to Jerome, were *Contra gentes* and *Libri ad Valentinianum*. Socrates knows of a book " Against All Heresies " and Rufinus of a tract on the symbol (*MPL*, xxi. 336). (F. LOOFS.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The principal sources are Epiphanius, *Hær.*, lxxi.; Hilary, Fragments 1–3, and *De Trinitate*, vii. 3–7; Socrates, *Hist. eccl.*, ii. 30, Eng. transl., *NPNF.* 2 ser., ii. 44–45, 56–58; Vigilius of Thapsus, *MPL*, lxii. 179 sqq., and *MPL*, xxxv. 2213–2214. These are mostly collected in M. de Larroque, *Dissertatio duplex*, Geneva, 1670. Consult, besides the literature under Arianism and Monarchianism, especially that under Diodorus and Marcellus of Ancyra; *DCB*, iv. 394–395; C. R. W. Klose, *Geschichte und Lehre des Marcellus und Photinus*, Hamburg, 1837; C. W. F. Walch, *Historie der Ketzereien*, iii. 1–70, Leipsic, 1766; Fabricius-Harles, *Bibliotheca Græca*, ix. 222–226, Hamburg, 1804; Tillemont, *Mémoires*, vol. vi.; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, vols. i.–ii., Eng. transl., ii. 188–189, Fr. transl., vol. i., passim; Harnack, *Dogma*, vols. i.–v. passim; Neander, *Christian Church*, vol. ii. passim.

PHOTIUS, fo'shi-us.

I. Life.
Early Life (§ 1).
First Patriarchate (§ 2).
Decisive Break with Rome (§ 3).
Years of Retirement (§ 4).
Second Patriarchate (§ 5).
II. Writings.
Bibliotheca (§ 1).
Amphilochia (§ 2).
Polemical Works (§ 3).
Other Writings (§ 4).
Editions (§ 5).

Photius, twice patriarch of Constantinople in the ninth century, enjoys an almost unparalleled preeminence in both the Greek and the Russian Church of the present day. Though in his own time he had enemies, and though circumstances clouded his fame at Rome and at the Byzantine court, he took deep hold among his people from the first, and soon after his death his Church put his name in her calendar of saints. To judge his character is not easy. He was not the tyrant that his opponents represented him to be, though he could be hard and domineering. He was crafty, double-tongued, and vain, but to be so lay in the character of his time and in the atmosphere of the Constantinople in which he lived. He was a sort of universal genius —philologian, philosopher, theologian, jurist, mathematician, man of science, orator, and poet; no original thinker but of powerful memory, of iron industry, of good esthetic sense, of great dialectic skill, far-seeing and clever in practical matters, of commanding will-power, a profound judge of men, and true in friendship, though also always exacting the return. His piety in its way was real. To him the Orthodox Church owes her understanding and appreciation of her distinction from the Latin. Proud already of her inheritance, Photius intensified and confirmed her self-consciousness, and gave her the pregnant catchwords which have never been forgotten.

I. Life: Photius was born at Constantinople, probably between 815 and 820, and died in the Armenian monastery of Bordi Feb. 6, 897 or 898.

1. Early Life. He was of a family of quality, rigidly orthodox, and friendly to images. His parents died early, " adorned with the martyr's crown," this probably meaning that, as friends of images, they were despoiled of their property and honors. It is known that they, with Photius, were excommunicated by an iconoclastic synod, but Photius himself appears never to have been in pecuniary straits. It is not possible to follow the course of his life closely before he became patriarch. When hardly more than a boy he began to give public lectures, first on grammar, then on philosophy and theology—an activity which was interrupted by an embassy " to the Assyrians," mentioned without further explanation in the preface to the *Bibliotheca* (see below, II., § 1); probably a visit to the court of the calif in Bagdad is meant. After the death of the Emperor Theophilus in 842, the Empress Theodora became regent for her young son, Michael III., called the Drunkard, assisted by her brother, Bardas, who from his sister's counselor speedily developed into her rival. Learning was now held in higher esteem than it had been by the preceding iconoclastic emperors, and Photius' relations with the court became very intimate. He was first secretary of state and captain of the bodyguard, and his brother Sergius was married to Irene, a younger sister of Theodora and Bardas. Photius himself was never married nor was he a monk. Bardas succeeded in entirely supplanting Theodora as regent, probably in 857, and, to nullify her influence, which was feared by the young Michael as well as by his uncle, it was proposed to immure her in a convent. The Patriarch Ignatius, however (see IGNATIUS OF CONSTANTINOPLE), was a partizan of Theodora and refused to lend himself to this plan, so that, on Nov. 23, 858 (or, according to others, 857), Bardas deposed him and chose Photius for his successor.

2. First Patriarchate. Photius undoubtedly belonged to a powerful party antagonistic to Ignatius, which included Bardas and was led by a certain Gregorius Asbesta. He was not a cleric, but the elevation of a layman to the patriarch's chair was not unprecedented. On five successive days (Dec. 20–24, 858) Gregorius hurried the candidate through the five grades necessary for the assumption of the patriarchate, and on Christmas Day he was enthroned. Ignatius, however, did not retire quietly, in spite of the efforts of Bardas and Photius to make him yield, and he had a large following, the monks being especially hostile to Photius. The ill-treatment of Ignatius and his friends was doubtless exaggerated, and, so far as it really occurred, was due to Bardas rather than to Photius. Photius exerted himself to secure episcopal sees for his friends and accomplished Ignatius' deposition, in apparently canonical form, by a synod in 859. Ignatius went

to Rome and sought aid from Pope Nicholas I. (q.v.). At first Photius ignored this move, but ultimately he sent a particularly impressive legation to Nicholas with a notification of his enthronization which completely concealed the real situation. A letter from the emperor went with it asking for recognition of Photius and requesting that legates be sent to a council in Constantinople to settle the few remaining problems connected with the iconoclastic disorders. At the same time Photius wrote to the Eastern patriarchs concealing the facts even more than in his letter to the pope and evidently wishing to secure recognition from them before the pope's legates should arrive in Constantinople. The council (called "first-second"—*prima-secunda*) met in May, 861, and from the very first the papal legates, Rodoald of Porto and Zacharias of Anagni, espoused Photius' side. Ignatius was very summarily treated and his deposition was confirmed, although he received more support from the assembled bishops than the emperor and Photius had expected.

Nicholas seems to have hoped that Photius would recognize the primacy of jurisdiction, which he had assumed from the first. But Photius had no such intention, however much he may have been willing to flatter. The pope proceeded slowly, but on Mar. 18, 862, he issued an encyclical to the Eastern bishops in which he disavowed the acts of his legates at the council and declared: "We do not consider Ignatius deposed nor do we recognize Photius as in episcopal orders." He wrote to the emperor and to Photius to the same effect, and a year later (Apr., 863), when it had become evident that writing accomplished nothing, he had his judgment confirmed by a synod in Rome and threatened Photius and his adherents with excommunication. Meanwhile Photius found unexpected support from certain Western bishops who had fallen out with Nicholas over the divorce of Lothair II. (see NICHOLAS I). He drew up a reply from the emperor to the pope in which he adopted a very lofty tone, even addressing Nicholas as the emperor's subject. The document is lost, though its tenor is evident from certain letters of Nicholas. The pope answered with spirit, but he failed to measure public opinion in Constantinople. The new Rome looked down with scorn on the old and its "barbarians' tongue," and Photius all his life disdained to learn Latin (see below, II., § 1). Constantinople regarded the connection of the papacy with the Carolingian empire as a manifestation of revolt. There was a firm determination to insist that the pope should at least respect ecclesiastical boundaries, and feeling on this point was excited at the time by the case of the Bulgarians, who, converted by eastern missionaries and placed under the jurisdiction of the ecumenical patriarch by the Council of Chalcedon, were showing some disposition to go over to Rome (see BULGARIANS, CONVERSION OF THE). Photius, apparently in 865, addressed a long letter to the newly converted Bulgarian Bogoris; but the latter, doubtless for political reasons, turned to the pope, who sent two legates and a number of priests, as well as a voluminous pastoral epistle to the prince. At the same time Nicholas sent three messengers with no less than eight letters addressed to the emperor, Bardas, Photius, and all concerned, even the senators of Constantinople, requiring the execution of his judgment. The emperor, however, turned the pope's envoys back at the border, and the letters were not delivered.

Photius now executed the master stroke which really separated East and West. As the pope had attacked the validity of his ordination and position, so he called in question the pope's own position, declaring the pontiff to be a patron of heresy. The encyclical to the patriarchs of the East in which Photius made the charge and sought to prove it is rightly regarded as the *magna charta* of the Orient in all its subsequent attitude and conduct toward the Occident. Leaving personal matters quite out of account, and not hinting at the relations between Nicholas and himself, Photius spoke only of the danger which threatened from Rome, making the sending of Roman priests to the Bulgarians his starting-point and ending with an attack on the *Filioque* (see FILIOQUE CONTROVERSY), concerning which he wrote a minute theological discussion with fourteen arguments against the doctrine of double procession. He wished to hold a synod in Constantinople to counteract the work of the West, and it actually met in the summer of 867. The acts are lost, but Photius secured the decrees which he wished, and he then allowed his personal resentment to appear when he retaliated for his own excommunication by Nicholas with anathematizing the pope. He seems even to have attempted to exalt the new Rome over the old and to have thought of claiming the primacy for Constantinople.

3. Decisive Break with Rome.

Photius' triumph was short-lived. Bardas had been murdered in 866, and Basil the Macedonian had succeeded him as joint ruler with Michael. In Sept., 867, Basil had Michael murdered and became sole ruler. He thought it would strengthen his position if Ignatius were restored. Accordingly, Photius was expelled from his palace a few days after Basil's accession, and on the anniversary of his deposition, Nov. 23, 867, Ignatius was reenthroned, ten days after the death of Nicholas I. Basil deemed a break with the West inopportune, and, after negotiating for a year with Rome, he called a council (the Fourth Constantinople, Oct. 5, 869–Feb. 28, 870; the eighth general council of the West) which brought about the full restitution of Ignatius, at the same time officially deposing and condemning Photius. It was dominated by the Pope Adrian II. (q.v.), but his triumph was more apparent than real. In the West this council is regarded as the settlement of the controversy over images; but Photius could claim with reason that he had finally allayed this strife by the council of 861; and when the papal legates at the council demanded recognition of the claims of Rome concerning the Bulgarians, the Orientals protested in words which showed how the alliance of the pope with the West rather than with the East burned in all Greek souls.

4. Years of Retirement.

Photius lived at Stenos, on the European side of the Bosphorus, under strict surveillance and de-

prived of his books. Direct association with his friends was forbidden, but he was allowed to correspond with them freely. His following among the clergy was so great that at first scarcely twenty bishops appeared at the council which condemned him, and, in spite of the strenuous exertions of his enemies, only a little over 100 were present at the final session. Harsh measures against his adherents made it easy for him to organize a sort of antihierarchy, and he well knew how to hold his party together and to animate all with his own unyielding spirit, which steadily refused to hear of compromise. Gregorius Asbesta and a whole company of influential metropolitans stood by him faithfully. At the same time he carefully refrained from attacking the emperor in all that he wrote, and the time came when he could move more freely. His requests for favor to his friends were listened to, the emperor even consulted him on theological questions, and finally (probably in 876) he was recalled to Constantinople as tutor to the princes royal. It was evident that after the imminent death of Ignatius, Photius would again ascend his throne.

Ignatius died Oct. 23, 878 (according to others, 877), and three days later Photius was installed in his place. The relations between Photius and Basil were thenceforth of the best. Basil asked Pope John VIII. (q.v.) to recognize the reinstated patriarch, and this time the pope, needing imperial support for his schemes in Italy, showed a disposition to comply. He declared Photius' first elevation illegal, however, criticized the second because it had taken place without his knowledge, and stipulated that Photius should ask pardon before a synod. This was not at all to Photius' mind, and he accordingly contrived that a council should meet in Constantinople (the "Synod of St. Sophia," Nov., 879–Jan. 26, 880, the eighth general council of the East), attended by three times as many bishops as the council of 869. From this he obtained all that he desired, and the acts read as though the papal legates did not fully comprehend what they were doing. Photius was very amiable and apparently submissive to "his beloved brother," John, but he obscured the full meaning of his demands, and, remaining in the background himself, spoke in the council through others. The emperor kept away from the council; but after it was officially closed, he presided, at the instance of Photius, over two supplementary assemblies, at the first of which those present, including the papal legates, declared their adherence to the old creed. In the second Photius had one of the bishops deliver an address which in no veiled terms put him above the pope. Later, for political reasons, John rather outbid his legates than disavowed them.

5. Second Patriarchate.

Photius was now at the zenith of his power and glory, but relations with Rome soon became strained again. In 882 John VIII. was succeeded by Marinus I., the first pope who had previously been bishop of a non-Roman see and who had not been chosen directly from the Roman clergy. That he himself had made many translations did not deter Photius from using this technical irregularity against his Roman rival. Though his pontificate was too brief for any real results, Marinus renewed the ban against Photius, whereupon the latter stirred up afresh the strife over the procession of the Holy Spirit (see below, II., § 3). On Aug. 29, 886, the Emperor Basil died unexpectedly. His successor, Leo VI., had been Photius' pupil and originally was devoted to him, though for unknown reasons he had been the patriarch's bitter enemy since 880. Like Basil at his accession, Leo determined to be rid of Photius. He was ruthlessly deprived of his office and was banished to the monastery of Bordi in Armenia, where he lived probably a full decade or more. With his second downfall, however, Photius disappears from history.

It should be noted that Photius' contest with the popes did not absorb all his powers. He always found time for learning and art. He promoted missions to the Bulgarians and Russians; he sought relations with the Saracen princes, primarily for the good of the Christians under their rule and because of the holy places in Palestine; and he watched and endeavored to convert the Paulicians and other heretics both within and without the empire. Though some of his acts may be criticized, he had a lofty concept of his duty both as "watchman" against the West and as supreme shepherd of the East, and he performed it with zeal and energy. The Greeks are right when they reckon him among the foremost of all their spiritual leaders.

II. Writings: Measured by the standard of his time, Photius ranks very high as scholar; in the ninth century he is a phenomenon of learning and good judgment. Even when measured by a more exacting standard, he is still far from contemptible; his books were literary treasure-houses for the later dark ages of his people and have their value even now. The best-known and most important for the present time is that commonly called the *Bibliotheca* or *Myriobiblon*, which presents summary accounts (cited as "codices") of 280 books read and studied by Photius, put together without apparent plan of arrangement and varying much in length and method of treatment. Some codices are mere brief synopses of contents; others contain excerpts, which steadily grow longer as the work proceeds; and some include critical remarks, which also vary from superficial opinions to carefully weighed and exact judgments. Possibly the book epitomizes Photius' academic lectures or gives specimens from them. It purports to have been written at the request of "our dear brother, Tarasius," who asked Photius, when he was preparing for his journey "to the Assyrians" (see above, I., § 1), to leave behind on his departure a description of books which he had read with his scholars at times when Tarasius could not be present. In its present form the work can hardly have been composed under such conditions; perhaps it originated as indicated at Tarasius' request and was elaborated later. It takes account of both heathen and Christian writers, and includes not a few works which are now lost. Historians, theologians, philosophers, grammarians, physicists, as well as acts of councils, martyrs, and saints, are reviewed. The rhetoricians appear to have been particularly interesting to Pho-

1. Bibliotheca.

tius. Of theologians the dogmaticians proper are preferred. The poets hardly appear, and the great philosophers of ancient Greece are scarcely mentioned, perhaps from an evident intention to treat only less-known works. Thucydides, Polybius, Plutarch, and writers like Hippocrates and Pausanias are also left out of account, and the more famous theologians are treated briefly. Athanasius, Chrysostom, Gregory Nazianzen, and Basil are often mentioned, but only their rarer works receive extended notice. The summaries are often excellent, and Photius' remarks on the style of his authors show good and cultivated taste. For his biographical notices he used an abridgment of a work of Hesychius of Miletus. Latin writers he knew only in translation.

2. Amphilochia.

The *Amphilochia* is so called because it is dedicated to Amphilochius of Cyzicus, one of the truest friends and oldest disciples of Photius, who had propounded certain questions to his teacher and who is often mentioned in the work. It consists of a series of questions and answers (300 in number according to the prologue; in existing manuscripts and editions the number is greater and variable, and the order is not the same), chiefly relating to Biblical topics, but including some which belong to dogmatics and philosophy and some which hardly appertain to theology at all. The Bible questions generally relate to passages which appear to be contradictory, the so-called enantiophanies of Scripture, and some of the answers are merely exegetical expositions. Many passages are treated more than once. As in the *Bibliotheca*, the answers vary greatly in length, some being mere notes, others almost treatises, and there is no apparent plan. Most of the answers evidently belong to the time of the first exile of Photius, and may have been communicated by letter. It is possible that Photius collected them later, and probably the work was expanded with time. The author shows little originality, excerpting whole sections from Chrysostom, Polychronius, Germanus of Constantinople, John of Damascus, and others, and elsewhere being dependent on Athanasius, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Dionysius the Areopagite, Maximus Confessor, and others without directly copying them. In no less than thirty-two passages he repeats Theodoret almost verbally. The long, minute, and keen first answer addressed to Amphilochius may, however, be original.

3. Polemical Works.

The best-known of Photius' polemical works is the "Treatise on the Mystagogy of the Holy Spirit," written against the *Filioque*. It was an incident of the renewed strife with Rome begun by Marinus (see above, I., § 5) and belongs to the years 885 or 886. It is throughout an independent product of Photius. It was he who gave the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit the sharp and precise definition which it ever afterward had in dogmatics. It is significant that the doctrine is not mentioned in the *Amphilochia;* it had no immediate interest for Photius, and only the need of points of attack upon the West led him to elaborate it. After a brief introduction he fixes on John xv. 26, as the *locus classicus* of the doctrine, where Christ says that the Spirit proceeds "from the Father." To add that he proceeds also from the Son is held to lead to absurdities; it makes the Spirit a "product of the Son," and it destroys the unity of the three Persons of the Trinity (iii., iv.). The latter argument remained the leading one of all Eastern polemics against the West in the *Filioque* controversy. The consequences of the addition are further considered in chaps. vi.–xix., xxxi.–xlvii., and lxi.–lxiv. Such passages as John xvi. 14 and Gal. iv. 6 are declared to be invalid arguments against the position of Photius (xx.–xxx., xlviii.–lx., xc.–xciv.). In chap. v. he asserts that the Fathers and councils are unanimous against the addition; and in chaps. lxv.–lxxxix. he examines the utterances of such western authorities as Ambrose, Augustine, and Jerome, and the popes from Damasus to Adrian III., and maintains that they support the contention of the East. The "Dissertation on the (New) Sprouting of the Manicheans" is a work against the Paulicians (q.v.). It consists of four books, of which the first gives a historical account of the Paulicians as New Manicheans, and the remainder a dogmatic and Biblical refutation of their doctrines. Books ii.–iv. do not fully accord with the plan as laid down in book i., and it has been suggested that they are a working-over of twelve lectures against the Manicheans. The fourth book appears to be an independent work and later than ii. and iii. If genuine, it probably belongs to the time of the first exile, since in it the author complains of being deprived of his books. The first book is closely related to the *Historia Manichæorum* ascribed to Petrus Siculus (*MPG*, civ. 1240 sqq.). The "Precise Conclusions and Proofs," in the form of questions and answers, furnishes a compendium of historical documents (acts of synods, etc.) relating to metropolitans, bishops, and the like; and it has been held that Photius wrote it as an indirect defense of his elevation and his opposition to Rome, as well as a refutation of the arguments advanced by his opponents against his legitimacy.

4. Other Writings.

Hergenröther knew of twenty-two addresses by Photius, of which only two were printed (*MPG*, cii. 548 sqq.). Eighty-three "addresses and homilies" are now offered by Aristarches (see below, § 5), but the greater number of these are compositions of the editor rather than of Photius. No doubt Photius' works contain passages which were originally parts of spoken discourses; but it may well be questioned whether it is possible to select these fragments and put them together so as properly to reproduce the original addresses. At the same time, the collection offers some important *inedita* which are attested by manuscript evidence as real specimens of Photius' homiletic manner and skill. In general his thought follows the old and familiar channels of his Church. He is fluent and figurative, soars not seldom in a real flight, but more often shows mere floridity and phrasing. Photius' letters are the most important source for his character and type of thought. Migne arranges them in three books: political letters to popes, patriarchs, bishops, emperors, and other princes (24 numbers);

private letters to bishops, clerics, monks, etc., mostly letters of encouragement, recommendation, admonition, and the like (102 numbers, many of them very short); and letters to laymen, especially high officials (67 numbers). Valettas (see below, § 5) gives a larger number disposed in five books: "dogmatic and hermeneutic letters" (84 numbers); "parenetic letters" (57 numbers); "consolatory letters" (15 numbers); "letters of censure" (64 numbers); and "miscellaneous letters" (40 numbers, mostly brief friendly notes).

Photius' other writings include: Bible commentaries, of which only fragments are preserved (cf. *MPG*, ci. 1189–1253). A lexicon intended as a help to the understanding of authors whose diction was no longer current in the ninth century; it shows little originality and perhaps belongs to Photius' youth; probably he had help in composing it. Poems, of which three odes on Basil and a hymn of nine odes on Christ are known (the former in *MPG*, cii. 577 sqq., the latter in the *Ekklesiastike Aletheia*, Constantinople, 1895). An "Exhortation by Means of Proverbs" is published by J. Hergenröther in his *Monumenta Græca ad Photium ejusque historiam pertinentia* (Regensburg, 1869, pp. 20–52), as well as some fragments of philosophical writings (pp. 12 sqq.) and a not uninteresting extract from a work "On the Holy Liturgy" (pp. 11–12). For lost works of Photius (against the Emperor Julian, against Leontius of Antioch, and probably also a study on contradictions in the Roman codes) cf. Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, p. 522.

Photius was not the author of the *Nomocanon*, the standard law-book of the Eastern Church (see Nomocanons). It is older than his time, though it was supplemented during his patriarchate (in 883, according to the preface), and his councils of 861 and 879 had a part in this work. Whether Photius himself prepared the new edition is uncertain; but it is at least evident that he had a good knowledge of canon law, for some of his letters expound legal points in an illuminating manner. The canons of his councils were certainly Photius' work, and the *Bibliotheca* proves his acquaintance with the legal literature.

5. Editions. Photius' writings are collected in *MPG*, ci.–civ. The last two volumes contain the *Bibliotheca*, the text being that of Immanuel Bekker (2 vols., Berlin, 1824). Migne's text of the *Amphilochia* (vol. ci.) was furnished by Bishop Jean Baptiste Malou, with the help of Hergenröther, from a Vatican manuscript and without knowledge of the manuscript of Mt. Athos, which is the basis of the more valuable edition published by Constantinus Œconomus (Athens, 1858). The "Mystagogy of the Holy Spirit" was first edited by Hergenröther (Regensburg, 1857); his text is reprinted with copious notes in Migne (cii.). The "Dissertation on the Manicheans" was first published in complete form (four books) by Johann Christoph Wolff in his *Anecdota Græca*, i.–ii (Hamburg, 1722), whence it was reprinted by Migne (cii. pp. 15 sqq.). The work referred to above as "Precise Conclusions and Proofs" is given by Migne (civ. 1219 sqq.) under the title "Ten Questions and Answers." The most complete collection of Photius' addresses and sermons (or of what purport to be such; see above, II., § 4) is S. Aristarches' "Eighty-three Addresses and Homilies of Photius" (2 vols., Constantinople, 1900). The letters (reprinted from older works) are in *MPL*, cii., as well as in the much better and more complete edition by Johannes Valettas, "Letters of Photius" (London, 1864); as supplements, Valettas prints the "Ten Questions and Answers" mentioned above and a similar "Five Questions and Answers." A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus has attempted to supplement Valettas in his *Sancti Patriarchæ Photii epistolæ xlv.* (St. Petersburg, 1896), though in his *Photiaka* (1897) he states that only the first twenty-one letters really belong to Photius, the others being properly ascribed to Isidore of Pelusium. The best edition of the lexicon is by S. A. Naber (2 vols., Leyden, 1864–65). Certain fragments and treatises of lesser moment are published in J. Hergenröther, *Monumenta græca ad Photium ejusqe historiam pertinentia* (Regensburg, 1869), and in A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Monumenta græca et latina ad historiam Photii patriarchæ pertinentia* (2 parts, St. Petersburg, 1899–1901). The writing "On the Franks and the Other Latins," printed by Hergenröther in the first of these collections (pp. 62 sqq.), is shown in his *Photius* (iii. 172 sqq.) to be spurious; it is probably subsequent to the time of Michael Cærularius. For the *Scripta canonica* (including the *Nomocanon*), cf. *MPG*, cv.

(F Kattenbusch.)

Bibliography: The most accessible compend of epistolary and conciliar sources is Mansi, *Concilia*, xv. 159 sqq., xvi. 1 sqq., 209 sqq., 295 sqq., 413 sqq., 425 sqq., xvii. 365 sqq.; to this may be added the material in *MPG*, cv. 509 sqq., cviii. 1037 sqq., cix. 155 sqq., 663 sqq., 985 sqq. The work of first rank is J. Hergenröther, *Photius, sein Leben, seine Schriften, und das griechische Schisma*, 3 vols., Regensburg, 1867–69. Exceedingly useful is Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, 73 sqq., 515 sqq., 971 sqq., where an excellent list of literature is found, including a very full statement of editions of the works. Consult further: Fabricius-Harles, *Bibliotheca Græca*, x. 670 sqq., xi. 1 sqq., Hamburg, 1807–08; J. N. Jager, *Histoire de Photius*, Paris, 1854; L. Tosti, *Storia dell' origine dello scisma greco*, 2 vols., Florence, 1856; H. Lämmer, *Papst Nikolaus und die byzantinische Staatskirche seiner Zeit*, Berlin, 1857; A. Pichler, *Geschichte der kirchliche Trennung zwischen dem Orient und Occident*, i. 180 sqq., Munich, 1864; R. Baxmann, *Die Politik der Päpste von Gregor I. bis auf Gregor VII.*, ii. 1 sqq., Elberfeld, 1869; A. F. Gfrörer, *Byzantinische Geschichten*, vols. ii.–iii., Graz, 1873; B. Jungmann, *Dissertationes selectæ*, iii. 319–442, Regensburg, 1882; A. Gasquet, *L'Empire byzantin et la monarchie franque*, pp. 348–372, Paris, 1888; G. Bernhardy, *Grundriss der griechischen Litteratur*, vol. i., Halle, 1892; F. W. F. Kattenbusch, *Vergleichende Konfessionskunde*, i. 118 sqq., Freiburg, 1892; A. H. Hore, *Eighteen Centuries of the Orthodox Greek Church*, 365–369, 376–383, London, 1899; idem, *Students Hist. of the Greek Church*, ib. 1902; W. F. Adeney, *The Greek and Eastern Churches*, pp. 209, 235 sqq., 279–280, New York, 1908; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, xii. 719–734; Schaff, *Christian Church*, iv. 636–642; Neander, *Christian Church*, iii. 561–578 et passim; Harnack, *Dogma*, vols. ii.–v.; the literature under the articles on Popes John VIII., Martin II., Adrian III., Stephen V. and VI., and Formosus II., also contain matter that is pertinent; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, vol. iv.; *KL*, ix. 2082 sqq.

PHRYGIA, frij'i-ɑ: A region of fluctuating boundaries occupying the central portion of Asia Minor. At the beginning of the Christian era the name had merely an ethnological and no geographical significance. There was no Roman province of the name Phrygia until the fourth century. In the northern part were the cities of Ancyra, Gordician, Doryleum; in the southern, Colossæ, Hierapolis, Laodicea. The region is of great importance for the history of religion after about 200 B.C., the cults of the West imported from the East receiving a profound impress from the primitive usages still current in Phrygia. Especially is this the case with the mysteries so strongly renascent in the century before the Christian era. See Asia Minor.

PHUT. See Table of the Nations, § 6.

PHYLACTERY. See Tefillin.

PIACENZA, SYNOD OF. See Urban II.

PIARISTS, pai'a-rists: A Roman Catholic order of men having as its aim the giving of free juvenile instruction especially to poor boys. The members are variously known by other names, such as Piarians, Scolopians, and Paulinists. Their beginning was an independent brotherhood founded at Rome in 1597 by the Spanish nobleman José Calasanze; they received their constitution as a congregation for their present function in 1617, and were promoted to an order by Gregory XV in 1621, with the title, Congregatio Paulina clericorum regularium pauperum matris Dei scholarum piarum. The order ranks second in importance as a religious brotherhood for the instruction of boys.

José Calasanze (Josephus a Matre Dei) was born in the Castle Calasanze near Petralta de la Sal in Aragon Sept. 11, 1556; and died at Rome Aug. 25, 1648. He studied law at Lerida and theology at Alcala and became a priest in 1583. In 1592 he went to Rome, where as a strict ascetic and a member of four religious brotherhoods he devoted himself to the care of the sick and the instruction of youth. In 1612, the number of scholars was 1,200. Soon a division into popular and higher schools was required; in 1630 Calasanze established the Nazarene College at Rome for noble youths; and in 1632 Pope Urban VIII. made him general for life. The order extended its work from Italy, so that after 1631 it had spread over Germany, Poland, Hungary, and other lands; but on account of its pedagogical results it aroused the jealousy of the Jesuits, which led to Calasanze's downfall. In 1646 the order was reduced to a secular brotherhood without vows. Alexander VII. restored it in 1660 to a congregation, yet without its fourth vow; Clement IX. granted this in 1669, and raised it to a formal order; and Innocent XII. in 1698 restored its mendicant privileges. Calasanze was canonized by Clement XIII. in 1767. The order, distributed in nine provinces, consists of 121 houses and 2,100 members and is strongest in Spain. (O. Zöckler†.)

Bibliography: Among the sketches of the life of the founder may he named those hy J. Timon-David, 2 vols., Marseilles, 1884 (best); A. della Concettione, Rome, 1693; F. J. Lipowsky, Munich, 1720; W. E. Huhert, Mainz, 1886; N. Tommaseo, Rome, 1898; D. M. Casasnovas y Sanz, Saragossa, 1904; and J. C. Heidenreich, Vienna, 1907. For the Constitutions consult L. Holsten, *Codex regularum monasticarum et canonicarum*, ed. M. Brockie, Augshurg, 1759. Consult: Heimhucher, *Orden und Kongregationen*, iii. 287–296; L. Kellner, *Erziehungsgeschichte in Skizzen und Bildern*, i. 327 sqq., Essen, 1880; H. Zschokke, *Die theologische studien der katholischen Kirche in Oesterreich*, Vienna, 1894; A. Brendler, *Das Wirken der . Piaristen*, Vienna, 1896; F. Endl, in *Mittheilungen der Geschichte für deutsche Erziehungs- und Schulgeschichte*, VIII., 147 sqq., Helyot, *Ordres monastiques*, iv. 281–282; *KL*, ix. 20–96 sqq.

PI-BESETH, pî-bê'seth: An Egyptian city mentioned in Ezek. xxx. 17, together with Aven (On); called by the Greeks (and the Septuagint) Boubastos, or, more rarely, Boubastis. It was situated in the Delta on the right bank of the eastern arm of the Nile. The Hebrew name represents the Egyptian Per-Baste(t), "House of Bast," the local goddess who was represented as a cat or as a woman with a feline head. The real name of the city was Bast, from which the name of the goddess was derived. Pi-beseth was the residence of the Lybian kings of the Twenty-second Dynasty, including Shishak; and in Christian times was an episcopal see-city. The extensive ruins of its temples are at Tell Basta, near the modern Zakaziḳ.

(G. Steindorff.)

Bibliography: The Eighth *Memoir* (for 1889–90) of the Egypt Exploration Fund (q.v.); the literature under Leontopolis, and part of that (on exploration and discovery) under Egypt.

PICARDS (PICKARDS): A corruption of "Beghards" (see Beghards, Beguines), applied as a term of reproach to the Bohemian Brethren (q.v., I., § 4).

PICK, BERNARD: Lutheran; b. at Kempen (27 m. s.s.w. of Essen), Prussia, Dec. 19, 1842. He was educated at the universities of Breslau and Berlin, and at Union Theological Seminary, from which he was graduated in 1868. He was then pastor at New York City (1868–69), North Buffalo, N. Y. (1869–70), Syracuse, N. Y. (1870–74), Rochester, N. Y. (1874–81), Allegehany, Pa. (1881–95), Albany, N. Y. (1895–1901). Since 1905 he has occupied a pastorate in Newark, N. J. He has translated F. Delitzsch's *Jewish Artisan Life in the Time of Christ* (New York, 1883) and H. Cremer's *Essence of Christianity* (1903); has edited *Luther's "Eine Feste Burg" in Nineteen Languages* (New York, 1883); and has written *Luther as a Hymnist* (Philadelphia, 1875); *Jüdisches Volksleben zur Zeit Jesu* (Rochester, N. Y., 1880); *Historical Sketch of the Jews since the Destruction of Jerusalem* (New York, 1887); *The Life of Jesus according to extra-canonical Sources* (1887); *The Talmud, what it is, and what it knows about Jesus and his Followers* (1888); *Historical Sketch of the Jews since their Return from Babylon* (Chicago, 1892); *Vade Mecum Homileticum, i.* (Cleona, Pa., 1899); *The Extra-canonical Life of Christ* (New York, 1903); *Extra-canonical New Testament Writings of the First Two Centuries* (1905); *Lyra Gerhardti: A Selection of Paul Gerhardt's Spiritual Songs* (Burlington, Ia., 1906); *Hymns and Poetry of the Eastern Church* (1908); *Paralipomena: Remains of Gospels and Sayings of Christ* (1908); and *The Apocryphal Acts* (Chicago, 1909).

PICK, ISRAEL: Founder of the Amenian Congregation; b. about 1830. Baptized as a Christian at Breslau in 1854, he professed that by so doing he did not renounce his Judaism, but became a Jew in the truest sense. All the law and ordinances of the Old Testament were included with the Christian sacraments as the ordinances of the new congregation founded by him, which he styled Amenian because in Christ (*Elohim-amen;* Isa. lxv. 16) all the promises of God are yea and amen (II Cor. i. 20). He gathered about 800 adherents, mainly at München-Gladbach. In 1859 he went to the Holy Land in search of a place of settlement for his followers and was never heard of again. His principal literary work was *Der Gott der Synagoge und der Gott der Judenchristen* (Breslau, 1854).

(O. Zöckler†.)

Bibliography: Consult Pick's *Briefe an meine Stammesgenossen*, Hamhurg, 1854; Hollenherg, in *Deutsche Zeitschrift für christliche Wissenschaft und christliches Leben*, 1857, nos. 6–8; J. E. Jörg, *Geschichte des Protestantismus in seiner neuesten Entwickelung*, ii. 294–300, Freiburg, 1857.

PICKETT, JAMES: Primitive Methodist; b. at Berwick Bassett (27 m. n. of Salisbury), England, Dec. 19, 1853. He received his education at Wootton Bassett, Wiltshire; was in business in London, 1870–76; entered the Primitive Methodist ministry, and served at Bognor, 1876–78; Southwark, 1878–81; Forest Hill, 1881–85; Leicester, 1885–97; and at Hull, 1891–1903; became general missionary secretary in 1903; and was elected president of the conference of his denomination, 1908.

PICO DELLA MIRANDOLA, pî'co del'la mi"rān-dō'lā, **GIOVANNI:** Italian philosopher; b. at Mirandola Feb. 24, 1463; d. at Florence Nov. 17, 1494. He studied at the University of Bologna (1477–79), and then visited the principal universities of Europe, pursuing the studies of philosophy and theology, learning as a means to this end Hebrew, Aramaic, and Arabic. In this arduous course of discipline he became a follower of Marsilio Ficino, and their common aim was to demonstrate the fundamental agreement of heathen philosophers with each other and with Christian scholasticism and mysticism. The root idea of this propaganda was that all truth is one and all science is one. Yet the substructure of Pico's system was derived from the Cabala. In 1487 he went to Rome where he proposed to hold a disputation covering the domain of knowledge, to which he invited the leading scholars as participants. As the themes of the discussion he issued 900 theses " in dialectics, morals, physics, mathematics, metaphysics, theology, magic, and cabalism." In publishing these he declared that he did not intend to defend anything regarded by the Church or its head as untrue or improbable. But the theologians declared some of the theses heretical at least in tendency, and the pope (Innocent VIII.) prohibited the disputation. Pico composed an apology, and went to France. He was later, through the intervention of Lorenzo de' Medici, permitted to return to Italy, and took up his residence near Florence, a member of the brilliant circle which gathered about Lorenzo. In 1493 a brief of the new pope, Alexander VI., relieved him of the taint of heresy. The humiliation suffered through the interdiction of the disputation led his thoughts toward celibacy, and when he died he had been contemplating retirement to a monastery, and for this he prepared by ascetic practises. He transferred his estates to his nephew, Giovanni Francesco, and bestowed his personal property on the poor.

Bibliography: Pico's *Opera* were published, 2 parts, Venice, 1498; again, ed. his nephew, with a life, ib. 1557; again, including the works of his nephew, 2 vols., Basel, 1572–1573, and (best) 1601. His *Epistolæ* were very often edited and published, e.g., Paris, 1500, 1520; Cologne, 1518. On his life and work consult: G. Dreydorff, *Das System des Johann Pico, Grafen von Mirandula und Concordia*, Marburg, 1858; W. H. Pater, *Studies in the Hist. of the Renaissance*, London, 1873; Pastor, *Popes*, v. 151, 154, 342–344, 389; Creighton, *Papacy*, iv. 164–166, 173; *KL*, viii. 1549–55. The life by his nephew, with three of his letters, his " Interpretation of Ps. xvi." his " Twelve Rules of a Christian Life," " Twelve Points of a Perfect Lover," and his " Hymn to God," transl. into Eng. from the Latin of Sir Thomas More, ed. J. M. Rigg, appeared London, 1890.

PICPUS, pîk"pus', **CONGREGATION OF (Congregation of the Sacred Heart of Jesus and Mary):** A Roman Catholic congregation founded at Paris in 1805. The founder, Pierre Marie Joseph Coudrin (b. 1768; d. Mar. 27, 1837) was led to undertake the work by contemplation of the effects of the French Revolution on morals and religion. He desired an organization the purpose of which should be the conversion and moral and religious instruction of both sexes, and should commemorate by suitable services four phases of the life of Christ—his childhood by free instruction of children, his private life by Perpetual Adoration of the Blessed Sacrament (q.v.), his public life by preaching and missions, and his suffering and death by the practise of austerities. He was encouraged and assisted by Bishop J. B. Chabot of Mende, and the congregation took its name from the street and buildings in Paris in which it was instituted. In 1817 confirmation was granted by Pius VII., after which seminaries were founded and preaching to the people was begun. In 1826 missions to the heathen were sent out, six priests going to the Sandwich Islands. In 1833 Gregory XVI. entrusted to the congregation the mission for eastern Oceania. From that time the two branches of work, education and preaching, were greatly extended. Missionaries went to various parts of Oceania and Australasia, to North and South America, and to Africa, while in all these parts as well as in Europe educational institutions were established, there being 200 with 12,000 scholars in Oceania alone. The celebrated Father Damien (see Veuster, Joseph de) was a member of the congregation, and a large number of equally devoted but less celebrated missionaries have contributed to success, and have added to the sum of knowledge by books dealing with the languages and ethnology of the islands and lands where they have labored.

There is a branch of the congregation for women, The Sisters of the Sacred Heart of Jesus and Mary, the foundation of which was laid in 1800 by Coudrin and Henriette Aymer de la Chevalerie (d. 1834). Prior to the separation of Church and State in France, the sisters had establishments in France, and such are still found in Belgium, Holland, Spain, England, and South America.

Bibliography: The *Constitutions* were printed Paris, 1840. Consult: A. Coudrin, *Vie de l'Abbé Coudrin*, Paris, 1846; S. Perron, *Vie de . . Pierre Marie-Joseph Coudrin*, ib. 1900; E. Keller, *Les Congrégations religieuses en France*, pp. 372, 434, ib. 1880; Helyot, *Ordres monastiques*, iv. 1277 sqq., Paris, 1859; Heimbucher, *Orden und Kongregationen*, iii. 471–473; *KL*, ix. 2102–05.

PICTET, pîc"tê', **BENEDICT:** Swiss Reformed; b. at Geneva May 30, 1655; d. there June 10, 1724. After receiving his education in the university of his native city, he made an extensive tour of Europe, after which he assumed pastoral duties at Geneva, and in 1686 was appointed professor of theology. In the domain of systematic theology, Pictet published two great works: *Theologia Christiana* (3 vols., Geneva, 1696; Eng. transl., *Christian Theology*, London, 1834) and *Morale chrétienne* (2 vols., 1692), in which he sought to revive the old and somewhat stagnating orthodox theology, though he was unable to prevent the Genevan " Company of

Pastors" from adopting a new formula of subscription in 1706. Pictet also distinguished himself as Christian poet, his hymns soon becoming popular conjointly with the Psalms, and some of them still being found in French hymnals. Mention should likewise be made of Pictet's *Huit sermons sur l'examen des religions* (3d ed., Geneva, 1716; Eng. transl., *True and False Religion examined; the Christian Religion defended; and the Protestant Reformation vindicated*, Edinburgh, 1797) and of his *Dialogue entre un catholique et un protestant* (1713; Eng. transl., *Romanist Conversations*, London, 1826).

EUGENE CHOISY.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: E. de Budé, *Vie de Bénédict Pictet*, Lausanne, 1874; J. Gaberel, *Hist. de l'église de Genève*, vol. iii., Geneva, 1862; C. Borgeaud, *Hist. de l'université de Genève*, ib. 1900; Lichtenberger, *ESR*, x. 599–600.

PICTURES, MIRACULOUS: Certain pictures or images believed by the Roman Catholic Church to confer special graces upon those who look at them, on the intercession of the saint represented in them, and on condition of more or less subjective susceptibility on the part of the beholder. Among these graces are recovery from illness, discovery of secrets, inspiration to good works, and the like. The popular notion ascribes miraculous powers to the pictures themselves; but theologians take pains to explain that God alone is the wonder-worker, and the picture only the locality and occasion of the miracle, by means of the intercession of the saint, or sometimes the means by which the miracle is worked, as in cases where the image is supposed to speak, to weep, or to open and close its eyes.

(C. GRÜNEISEN†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Council of Trent, session XXV., Latin and English in Schaff, *Creeds*, ii. 199–205; M. Chemnitz, *Examinis concilii O Tridentini . Opus*, Frankfort, 1565–1573, reprint, ed. Preuss, Berlin, 1861, Eng. transl., London, 1582; J. Marx, *Das Wallfahren in der katholischen Kirche*, Trèves, 1842.

PIE (PYE), pai: The name given to the index-table on which prior to the Reformation in England the directions for worship were written, and to the early ordinal or directory for priests, containing a table of daily services and a summary of the mass rubrics. The arrangement was complicated and obscure, and the investigation required to discover the proper order was sometimes extended. The result was great confusion in the services. The name is perhaps derived from *pica*, "magpie," and is the result of the "pied" appearance of the book caused by the printing of initials in red and the body in black type on white paper.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: W. Maskell, *Monumenta ritualia ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*, 3 vols., London, 1846–47; M. E. C. Walcott, *The English Ordinal; its Hist., Validity, and Catholicity*, ib. 1851; idem, *Sacred Archæology*, p. 445, ib. 1860; J. H. Blunt, *The Annotated Book of Common Prayer*, pp. 101 sqq., New York, 1908. A transl. of a pie is given in *The Roman Breviary*, transl. by John, Marquess of Bute, i. pp. xi.–l., Edinburgh, 1879.

PIEPER, pî'per, **ANTON:** German Roman Catholic; b. at Lüdinghausen (16 m. s.w. of Münster), Westphalia, Mar. 20, 1854. He was educated at the universities of Münster, Innsbruck, and Rome from 1874 to 1883 (D.D., Freiburg, 1883), and in 1890 became privat-docent for church history and Christian archeology at the University of Münster, associate professor of church history in 1896, and full professor of church history and Christian archeology in 1899. He has written *Papst Urban VIII. und die Mantuaner Erbfolgefrage* (Freiburg, 1883); *Die Propaganda-Congregation und die nordlichen Missionen in siebzehnten Jahrhundert* (Cologne, 1886); *Zur Entstehungsgeschichte der ständigen Nuntiaturen* (Freiburg, 1894); *Die päpstlichen Legaten und Nuntien in Deutschland, Frankreich und Spanien seit der Mitte des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts* (Münster, 1897); *Die alte Universität Münster 1773–1818* (1902); and *Christentum, römisches Kaisertum, und heidnischer Staat* (1907).

PIEPER, FRANZ AUGUST OTTO: Lutheran; b. at Carwitz (85 m. w. of Danzig), Pomerania, June 27, 1852. After studying at the gymnasium of Colberg, Pomerania, he graduated in 1872 at Northwestern University, Watertown, Wis., and in 1875 from Concordia Theological Seminary, St. Louis, Mo. He was Lutheran pastor at Manitowoc, Wis. (1875–78), professor of theology in Concordia Seminary (1878 to 1887), since president of the same institution, and also president of the Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and other states since 1899. In addition to his work as editor of *Lehre und Wehre*, he has written *Das Grundbekenntnis der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche* (St. Louis, Mo., 1880); *Lehre von der Rechtfertigung* (1889); *Gesetz und Evangelium* (1892); *Distinctive Doctrines of the Lutheran Church* (Philadelphia, 1892); *Unsere Stellung in Lehre und Praxis* (St. Louis, 1896); *Lehrstellung der Missouri-Synode* (1897); *Christ's Work* (1898); and *Das Wesen des Christentums* (1903).

PIERCE, LOVICK: Methodist Episcopal South; b. in Halifax County, N. C., Mar. 24, 1785; d. at Sparta, Ga., Nov. 9, 1879. With very limited education, he entered the ministry in South Carolina in 1804, and served as chaplain in the war of 1812, after which he studied medicine and practised at Greensborough, Ga., until about 1821, when he permanently resumed the ministry. He was abundant in labors; possessed remarkable physical endurance, and was a man of great intellectual force and moral power. He was a strong advocate of the Wesleyan doctrine of sanctification; and was one of the first to encourage, and did much to advance, the cause of higher education in his church. He was a member of the first delegated general conference of Methodism in 1812; and remained one of its chief representatives in its conferences as well as before the country until his death.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. M. Buckley, in *American Church History Series*, vol. v. passim, New York, 1895; and the other works cited under METHODISTS which cover his locality and period.

PIERIUS, pi-er'i-us: Presbyter of Alexandria. According to an excerpt from the "Christian History" of Philippus Sidetes by H. Dodwell, *Dissertatio in Irenæum* (Oxford, 1689), it appears that Pierius was the head of the catechetical school at Alexandria, the successor of Dionysius, and predecessor of Theognostus [c. 265 A.D.]. Photius also names Pierius as master of the school and teacher of Pamphilus. Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.*, VII., xxxii. 26, 27, 30, Eng. transl. in *NPNF*, 1 ser., i. 321–322,

cf. note 42) names Achillas, later bishop, as conductor of the school at that time, and if this is correct, the two might have been jointly at the head. At any rate his character, according to Eusebius, of ascetic, philosopher, exegete, and preacher, would present him as amply qualified. Sidetes also states, on the authority of a lawyer, Theodore, that Pierius and his brother Isidore were martyrs and had a very large church at Alexandria, which is also reported by Photius. Jerome (*De vir. ill.*, lxxvi.; also his second *Epist. ad Pammachium*, Eng. transl. in *ANF*, vi. 157) states that, after the persecution of Decius, Pierius lived at Rome. The work (*Biblion*) of Pierius to which Photius refers (Codex cxix.) consisted of twelve treatises or addresses, of which also Sidetes makes mention. One of these was an extemporaneous first Easter sermon, mentioned by Photius. The address upon the martyrdom of his pupil Pamphilus which contains exegetical elements is to be distinguished from the *Biblion*, and the representation of Jerome that he was the author of a commentary on I Corinthians is not substantiated. Pierius was a follower of Origen, was indeed called " the younger Origen," and his writings were studied with those of Origen.

(N. Bonwetsch.)

Bibliography: For Philippus Sidetes consult C. de Boor, in *TU*, v. 2 (1889), 169 sqq.; for Photius, use M. J. Routh, *Reliquiæ sacræ*, iii. 423 sqq., 5 vols., Oxford, 1846–48, *MPG*, x. 241 sqq., and the Eng. transl. in *ANF*, v. 157. Consult further: *ANF*, Bibliography, pp. 70–71 (contains detailed list of notices); Palladius, *Hist. Lausiaca*, chaps. xii., cxliii., in *MPG*, xxxiv.; Harnack, *Litteratur*, i. 439–441 (collects the passages), ii. 2, pp. 66–69, 71, 105, 123; idem, *Dogma*, ii. 95–96, 116, iv. 41; Bardenhewer, *Geschichte*, ii. 168 sqq.; Krüger, *History*, pp. 217–218; L. B. Radford, *Three Teachers of Alexandria*, Cambridge and New York, 1908.

PIERSON, ARTHUR TAPPAN: Presbyterian; b. at New York City Mar. 6, 1837. He was graduated at Hamilton College, Clinton, N. Y. (A.B., 1857), and Union Theological Seminary (1860), being minister of the Congregational Church at Winsted, Conn., in the summers of 1859 and 1860. He was then pastor at Binghampton, N. Y. (1860–1863), Waterford, N. Y. (1863–69), Detroit, Mich. (1869–82), Indianapolis, Ind. (1882–83), Bethany Church, Philadelphia (1883–89), Metropolitan Tabernacle, London (1891–93), and Christ Church, London (1902–03). In 1889–90 he made a missionary tour of the British Isles. Since 1888 he has been editor of the *Missionary Review of the World*, and was lecturer on missions in Rutgers College in 1891 and Duff lecturer in Scotland in 1892. He has written *The Crisis of Missions* (New York, 1886); *Many Infallible Proofs: Chapters on the Evidences of Christianity* (1886); *Evangelistic Work in Principle and Practise* (1887); *Keys to the Word: or, Helps to Bible Study* (1887); *The Divine Enterprise of Missions* (1891); *Miracles of Missions* (4 vols., 1891–1901); *The Divine Art of Preaching* (1892); *From the Pulpit to the Palm-Branch: Memorial of Charles H. Spurgeon* (1892); *The Heart of the Gospel* (sermons; 1892); *New Acts of the Apostles* (1894); *Life-Power: or, Character Culture, and Conduct* (1895); *Lessons in the School of Prayer* (1895); *Acts of the Holy Spirit* (1895); *The Coming of the Lord* (1896); *Shall we continue in Sin?* (1897); *In Christ Jesus: or, The Sphere of the Believer's Life* (1898); *Catharine of Siena, an ancient Lay Preacher* (1898); *George Müller of Bristol and his Witness to a Prayer-Hearing God* (1899); *Forward Movements of the last half Century* (1900); *Seed Thoughts for Public Speakers* (1900); *The Modern Mission Century viewed as a Cycle of Divine Working* (1901); *The Gordian Knot: or, The Problem which baffles Infidelity* (1902); *The Keswick Movement in Precept and Practice* (1903); *God's Living Oracles* (1904); *The Bible and Spiritual Criticism* (1906); *The Bible and Spiritual Life* (1908); and *Godly Self-control* (1909).

PIETISM.

I. Philipp Jakob Spener.
Early Life and Education (§ 1).
Frankfort and the Collegia Pietatis (§ 2).
The *Pia Desideria* (§ 3).
Attacks on Teachings and Collegia (§ 4).
Stormy Career at Dresden (§ 5).
Call to Berlin; Real Rise of Pietism (§ 6).
Spener's Closing Years (§ 7).
Personality and Theology (§ 8).
Part in Pastoral Reform (§ 9).
Promotion of Lay Religion (§ 10).
Cooperating Forces (§ 11).
II. Pietism at Halle.
Prestige of Francke and his Institutions (§ 1).
Unsuccessful War on Pietism (§ 2).
One-sided Nature of the Movement (§ 3).
Effect on Theological Study (§ 4).
III. Pietism in Württemberg.
Pietism Cordially Welcomed (§ 1).
Separatism and Tübingen Influence (§ 2).
Attitude toward Moravians (§ 3).
IV. The Spread of Pietism.
V The Nature and Influence of Pietism.
Complexity of Pietism (§ 1).
Lutheran Orthodoxy and Pietism (§ 2).
Disadvantages of Pietism (§ 3).
Influence on the Church (§ 4).
Religious Training and the Bible (§ 5).
Effect on Theology and Union (§ 6).
Forerunner of Religious Freedom (§ 7).
Conventicles and Lay Cooperation (§ 8).
Separatistic Tendencies (§ 9).
Rigid Austerity (§ 10).
Philanthropic and Missionary Activity (§ 11).
Pietism and the Enlightenment (§ 12).
Development and Origin (§ 13).
VI. Later Development.
Factors and Growth (§ 1).
Character of Modern Pietism (§ 2).
Estimate of the Movement (§ 3).

The term Pietism connotes a movement in behalf of practical religion within the Lutheran Church of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Established at Halle by Philipp Jakob Spener, and following distinct and individual courses of development in Halle, Württemberg, and Herrnhut, it received a bond of union in its conviction that the type of Christianity then prevailing in Lutheranism stood in urgent need of reform, and that this could be brought about by " piety," or living faith made active and manifest in upright conduct.

I. Philipp Jakob Spener: Philipp Jakob Spener, the founder of Pietism, was born at Rappoltsweiler (33 m. s.w. of Strasburg), Upper Alsace, Jan. 23, 1635; d. at Berlin Feb. 5, 1705. His parents gave him a devout education, and he received still more lasting religious impressions from his godmother, the widowed Agatha von Rappoltstein (d. 1648)

and her chaplain, Joachim Stoll (1615–78), finding additional spiritual nourishment in such works as the *Vom wahren Christentum* of Johann Arndt (q.v.) and German translations of the English devotional writers Emanuel Sonthomb (Emanuel Thompson?), Lewis Bayly, Daniel Dyke, and Richard Baxter.

1. Early Life and Education.

Spener began his university studies at Strasburg in May, 1651, devoting himself primarily to history, philosophy, and philology, and receiving his master's degree in 1653. He later gained a reputation as a student of genealogy and heraldry, particularly through his voluminous *Opus heraldicum* (2 vols., Frankfort, 1690). His theological teachers were Johann Schmidt (1594–1658), Sebastian Schmidt (1617–96), and especially Johann Konrad Dannhauer (q.v.). It was to the latter scholar that Spener was chiefly indebted for his living interest in the writings of Luther and the assertion of the religious rights of the laity, as well as for his subsequent avoidance of separatistic tendencies. As a student he lived a quiet, reserved life; his acquaintance confined itself to a few sympathetic friends; and his Sundays were devoted to serious reading and singing hymns with these friends, as well as to the composition of his *Soliloquia et meditationes sacræ*. He terminated his formal studies in 1659, and spent the next three years at Basel, Geneva, and Tübingen. Here his chief object was further knowledge of languages, literature, and history, but at the same time his religious development was profoundly influenced, notably by his acquaintance with Jean de Labadie (see Labadie, Jean de, Labadists), whom he met in Geneva. Though many desired Spener to remain in Württemberg, he accepted, in Mar., 1663, the position of assistant preacher at the cathedral in Strasburg, an appointment which was particularly attractive to him, since it allowed him time to pursue his studies and to attend lectures; and in the following year he received his theological doctorate.

2. Frankfort and the Collegia Pietatis.

Spener now planned to live a quiet scholar's life, and eventually to become a professor of theology. In 1666, however, he was called as senior to Frankfort, where he not only found that his new office restricted his customary and congenial scholastic leisure, but also that his Lutheran orthodoxy was doubted, and that he was accused of Calvinistic tendencies. Accordingly, on the eighth Sunday after Trinity, 1667, he delivered a sermon on "necessary caution against false prophets," among whom he classed the Reformed, who had a small congregation at Frankfort. Spener afterward regretted the attitude here taken against the Reformed, however, and sought as far as possible to prevent the circulation of his sermon. Very different, and far happier, were the results of his sermon on July 18, 1669, on the "vain righteousness of the Pharisees." Here he described this ineffectual righteousness of the Pharisees as that superficial security which is content with an external subscription to the orthodox Lutheran Church, and which is satisfied with a merely intellectual attachment to pure doctrine, outward participation in divine service and the sacraments, and abstinence from gross sins and vices. Most of his hearers were disposed to feel that Spener demanded too much from frail men, but others were startled into a salutary dread and were aroused to serious repentance.

It was those thus affected who, a year later (1670), participated in the *Collegia pietatis*, or private devotional gatherings, which Spener assembled twice a week in his house, this course being a decided innovation, though at first the meetings escaped attack. At the same time, Spener by no means restricted himself to the care of his little band of conventicle people, but strove to arouse and maintain personal and vital Christianity by preaching, by ecclesiastical discipline, and, most of all, by improving and animating the catechizings held each Sunday. His catechetical sermons and his catechism itself, the *Erklärung der christlichen Lehre nach der Ordnung des kleinen Katechismus Luthers* (Frankfort, 1677), were a fruit of these endeavors, as well as several annual series of sermons.

3. The Pia Desideria.

The event that formed an epoch in Spener's life and attracted wide attention was the publication of his little *Pia desideria* (Frankfort, 1675). In this work Spener first depicted the Christianity of his period, which left much to be desired in every rank and station. Nevertheless, God had promised better times for the Church militant, which were to begin when Israel should have become converted and papal Rome should have fallen. Meanwhile he proposed the following helpful measures: the word of God must be more widely diffused among the people, this end being furthered by discussions on the Bible under the pastor's guidance; the establishment and maintenance of the spiritual priesthood, which is not possessed by the clergy alone, but is rather constituted by the right and duty of all Christians to instruct others, to punish, to exhort, to edify, and to care for their salvation; the fact must be emphasized that mere knowledge is insufficient in Christianity, which is expressed rather in action; more gentleness and love between denominations are needed in polemics; the university training of the clergy must be changed so as to include personal piety and the reading of books of edification, as well as intellectual knowledge and dogmatic controversies; and, finally, sermons should be prepared on a more edifying plan, with less emphasis on rhetorical art and homiletic erudition.

4. Attacks on Teachings and Collegia.

Concretely regarded, these fundamental ideas of the *Pia desideria* were not new, but the very fact that Spener's treatise made so great a stir, and within a few years evoked a complete literature of its own, shows how imperative it was to emphasize such principles afresh. But amid much approval, there was, from the very first, no lack of opposition. This turned especially on the reiterated recommendation of private devotional gatherings in the *Pia desideria*. It was only now that the Frankfort conventicles became a center of general observation, visited by many,

copied by many, and also distrusted by many. [But while Spener hoped that the small bands of earnest Christians thus formed within the general congregation would serve as a spiritual leaven for the larger body, they possessed from the start the two inherent dangers of separatistic tendencies and, as being composed preponderatingly of laymen associated on the theory of the universal priesthood of all believers, of opposition to the clergy proper. Both these dangers proved real perils; and as early as 1677 complaints were lodged against the *collegia pietatis* by the police of Frankfort, while on Jan. 26, 1678, the Darmstadt consistory warned all pastors under its jurisdiction against them.] Spener defended his innovations, however, in his *Das geistliche Priestertum* (Frankfort, 1677), and finally transferred the meetings from his house to the church, only to be confronted with fresh difficulties. His assertion that conversion and regeneration were indispensable for the right study of theology was contested by Georg Konrad Dilfeld in his *Theologia Horbio-Speneriana* in 1679, only to be easily refuted by Spener in his *Allgemeine Gottesgelehrtheit aller gläubigen Christen und rechtschaffenen Theologen* (Frankfort, 1680).

Spener now hoped to proceed unmolested in his work, but his plans were abruptly frustrated in 1682 by the secession of a number of his most zealous friends and adherents from all connection with the Church. With the utmost reluctance Spener broke with the separatists for love of his church and his pastoral office, and even opposed them openly in his *Der Klagen über das verdorbene Christentum Missbrauch und rechter Gebrauch* (Frankfort, 1685). A portion of these Frankfort separatists emigrated to Pennsylvania in 1683; and Spener's position was still further complicated by misunderstandings with the municipal council, which proved little disposed to comply with his wishes in combating public offenses, regularly inspecting catechetical examinations, and effecting a better organization of the parishes and of the practise of confession.

Under these circumstances Spener decided, in the summer of 1686, to accept a call to Dresden as first chaplain to Elector John George III. of Saxony.

5. Stormy Career at Dresden.

Still greater conflicts awaited him here. The morals at the Saxon Court were crude and licentious, and Spener fell into disfavor with the elector by reproaching him, as his confessor on a fast-day, for his intemperance. The Saxon clergy, moreover, received Spener with distrust as a stranger, and his Dresden colleagues were offended when he began catechetical exercises in his house, deeming such a course beneath the dignity of a first court chaplain. In addition to all this, Spener alienated the Saxon universities of Leipsic and Wittenberg by his criticism of university conditions and the defective training of theological students in his *De impedimentis studii theologici* (1690). The conflict between the old orthodoxy and the new spirit represented by Spener became acute at Leipsic in 1689, when Spener's friends and pupils, who included August Hermann Francke and Paul Anton (qq.v.), organized, for purposes of edification, the so-called *collegia biblica*. [Three years previous, on July 18, 1686, at the instance of Johann Benedikt Carpzov (q.v.), their subsequent opponent, Francke and Anton had established a similar institution, the *collegium philobiblicum*, an association of eight masters who met at the house of Valentin Alberti (q.v.) for the study of the Bible. Gradually, under the influence of Spener, the devotional element gained ascendency over the technical theology that had been the purpose of the original society; but no open disturbance was created until Francke started the *collegia biblica*. His pietistic lectures now caused such a sensation among the students, however, as well as among the townsmen of Leipsic, that "doubtful conventicles and private assemblies" were forbidden by an electoral edict on Mar. 10, 1690, and Francke was eventually obliged to leave the university.]

A lively literary controversy now began concerning the merits of Pietism, but in 1691 Spener, who was deemed the spiritual leader of the Pietists, who were themselves opposed as sectaries, accepted a call to Berlin as provost of the Nikolaikirche. At

6. Call to Berlin; Real Rise of Pietism.

Berlin, unlike Saxony, Spener and Pietism were to a certain extent protected by Elector Frederick III. (King Frederick I. of Prussia after 1701); for the Reformed elector, desiring to establish peace in his land between Lutherans and Reformed was opposed to strict Lutheranism, and perceived in the practical and unionistic trend of Pietism an ally to his plans. In Brandenburg, accordingly, Spener exercised a profound influence over ecclesiastical conditions through his powerful patrons. He utilized this influence, after 1692, primarily to further the creation of a theological school after his own liking at the new University of Halle, its first significant exponent being A. H. Francke (q.v.).

Meanwhile the Pietistic movement had attracted wide circles and divided Lutheran Germany into two camps, organizing itself into a kind of party which, though claiming to be entirely orthodox and repudiating all attributes of heresy or sectarianism, was forced to struggle for existence against orthodoxy. The situation was still further complicated by the incorporation, after 1691–92, of certain chiliastic, enthusiastic, and ecstatic phenomena with the Pietistic movement. [As early as 1691 an unnamed opponent of Spener (probably C. A. Roth of Halle), in his *Imago Pietismi*, brought essentially the same charges against Pietism which were afterward constantly repeated in polemics against it.] Between 1691 and 1698 Spener alone exchanged some fifty controversial treatises with his antagonists. His chief opponents were Carpzov and Alberti in Leipsic, and such Wittenberg theologians as Johann Deitschmann (q.v.) and Johann Georg Neumann, the former of whom, in his *Christlutherische Vorstellung* (1695), written in behalf of the Wittenberg theological faculty, charged Spener with 283 erroneous teachings. Besides these opponents, there were Johann Friedrich Mayer (q.v.) in Hamburg, Samuel Schelwig (q.v.) in Danzig, and August Pfeiffer in Lübeck, the latter especially charging Spener with heterodox chiliastic views because of the *Behauptung der Hoffnung künftiger besserer*

Zeiten, which he had published in 1692. The controversy was the more bitter since Spener's opponents feared, not without reason, that Pietism represented a new religious tendency, though they were unable to grasp its true nature, much less to understand its relative justification.

7. Spener's Closing Years.

After 1698 Spener withdrew both from controversial writing and from public advocacy of Pietism, deeming further debate useless and his opponents as altogether incapable of amendment. In 1700–02, under the title *Theologische Bedenken*, he published at Halle four volumes of selections from his correspondence with both men and women, princes and statesmen, theologians and scholars, nobles and commoners, through which he had for decades exercised a profound influence on Germany. During his closing years his mood fluctuated between hopes for his cause and a dejection which was increased by many extravagances of his friends and followers. Nevertheless, from first to last he conscientiously fulfilled his duties as preacher and catechizer. His last literary labor was his anti-Socinian *Verteidigung des Zeugnisses von der ewigen Gottheit Christi* (Frankfort, 1706). He spent May, 1704, at Grosshennersdorf in Saxony, where he dedicated his godson, Zinzendorf, then four years old, to the advancement of the kingdom of God. After a severe attack of illness, Spener passed his seven last months tranquilly and with patience, though growing more and more feeble until his death, Feb. 5, 1705.

8. Personality and Theology.

Spener's was no heroic nature. He lacked bold initiative, as he himself knew; timidity and hesitation were inborn in him; and he was drawn into active life only by his living devotion, his moral earnestness, and his strong faith-born sense of duty and responsibility. Nevertheless, his Christianity was somewhat one-sided, restricted, and narrow; and, like his style, he was dry, prosy, and heavy. But notwithstanding this, his personality made a profound impression on many because of his unswerving earnestness, his conscientiousness and fidelity to duty, his ingenuous modesty, and his irenic temper.

Neither was Spener's importance inherent in his theology. He meant to be simply an orthodox Lutheran, and persistently dwelt on his harmony with the doctrinal standards of the Lutheran Church. At the same time, he shifted the center of interest from the maintenance of orthodox doctrine to conduct and practical piety, and from the objective validity of the verities of salvation and means of grace to the subjective conditions connected with them, their subjective ethical accountability then following as a necessary corollary. Spener was concerned, above all, with the true personal faith of the heart, which, he maintained, might coexist with serious doctrinal errors. At bottom, however, this meant a far graver revolution in existing dogmatic and theological tenets than Spener himself had surmised, and led, in practise, to connivance at all sorts of erroneous teachers, sectarians, and fanatics. This laxity afforded Spener's opponents a ground of attack, but their unskilful, superficial, and impassioned onslaughts not only lightened Spener's task of defense and substantiation, but also, unfortunately, helped to obscure his perception of the real consequences of his position. Spener's activity as a practical theologian and reformer may be summarized as efforts, on the one hand, to reform the clergy and their official ministration; and, on the other hand, to regenerate the ecclesiastical, religious, and moral life of the congregations and their members.

9. Part in Pastoral Reform.

In his attempted reform of the clergy, Spener justly discerned and combated the great defects in the theological studies of his time, especially the neglect of Biblical exegesis, undue stress on formal rhetoric and polemics, and, most of all, the worldly life of those busied with theology. He maintained that it was neither sufficient nor even the chief essential for a pastor simply to hold pure doctrine, stressing instead the importance of Christian character in the pastor with relation to his office and his official activity. He set forth the principle that the first and foremost object of preaching is to edify, to induct the hearers into the word of God, and to awaken and foster personal piety and Christian living, all erudition and fine rhetoric, unless they subserve that end, being from the realm of evil. The rise of Spener, therefore, betokened an advance in the cause of preaching and homiletics, even though he himself fell far short of realizing the ideal of a plain, Scriptural, and edifying style of preaching. He was an important factor in securing recognition of the great importance of the religious instruction of the young; and by his direct example he revived the languishing condition of catechetical training, combated the mechanical system of memorizing, emphasized the serious duty of religious tuition, strove to secure a practical method of catechetical instruction, introduced the Bible as a school text-book, and contributed largely toward the spread of confirmation in the Lutheran Church of Germany. The improprieties and misuses connected with private confession at the time of Spener were felt by him to be a heavy pastoral burden and responsibility, especially as he had little sympathy with the custom. He had, therefore, no direct personal interest in its retention or improvement. Any reform of it seemed to him possible and desirable only in connection with the formation of boards of elders who should share the responsibility of church discipline. Since, however, such an institution appeared impracticable at the time, Spener's influence on confession and ecclesiastical discipline was little more than negative. The importance of detailed pastoral care was taught by Spener more by precept than by example, though in private life, especially in association with the clergy, candidates, and students, he exerted a profound and pervasive influence in this direction, while his extensive correspondence made him known as the "father confessor of all Germany."

In his endeavor to reform the ecclesiastical, religious, and moral life of Germany Spener combated, among both clergy and laity, inert, conventional Christianity and reliance on mere external orthodoxy, unceasingly preaching the necessity of conscious, personal, vital, active, and practical Chris-

tian life. For the furtherance of this type of Christianity he recommended household devotions, extempore prayer, and Bible readings, as well as a stricter observance of Sunday. He labored earnestly in behalf of Christian discipline and morals, not only assailing current offenses in public and private life, but also raising the standard of conscience and refining the moral sense. In his reaction against the prevailing laxity and licentiousness which the Lutheran clergy judged too leniently as things indifferent, Spener's stress on Christian and moral earnestness was no less wholesome than justifiable. He also emphasized the rights, and still more the obligations, of the laity in the Church; opposed the monopoly of the clergy; energetically revived the theory of the common spiritual priesthood of all believers; promoted the cooperation of the laity in ecclesiastical administration; and procured both recognition and free scope for the spontaneous activity of laymen in the life of the Church, even though in the latter direction he merely gave expression to general ideas and wishes. He created no actual organizations, for neither was he the man, nor was the time yet ripe. Nevertheless, in an age of sharp denominational cleavage, Spener awoke the Protestant sense of fellowship between all communions that rested on the common basis of the Reformation. He helped pave the way toward friendly relationship between the Lutheran and Reformed Churches in Germany, both fortifying unionistic sentiment and preparing the means of union though rejecting any artificial and precipitate attempts at union. On the other hand, he was far more firmly convinced than most of the statesmen and clergy of his time that Roman Catholicism had deviated fundamentally from the Gospel of Christ, and that the "Roman peril" was real. He gave repeated expression to the thought of missions among Jews and heathen, and emphasized the missionary duty of Protestant Christianity at a time when the Lutheran Church had almost no conception of any such duty; and it was Spener's Pietistic friends, pupils, and disciples who went out from Halle in 1705 to the work of the Evangelical mission among the heathen, they being the first in Germany to attempt that field.

10. Promotion of Lay Religion.

In all these lines, indeed, Spener did not stand entirely alone among his contemporaries. He had his forerunners and colaborers. He was not the "Father of Pietism" in the sense that it emanated exclusively from him. He was met half-way, as it were, by a widely diffused sentiment in the Lutheran Church of Germany, and he was aided in many phases of the situation by the change which took place in the general spirit of the age. There were also cooperative influences proceeding from England, Holland, and Switzerland. For the Lutheran Church of Germany, however, Spener was the acknowledged and honorable protagonist; he was the most eminent advocate and the spiritual center of all those forces which so vigorously sought to reform the Lutheran Church in the last quarter of the seventeenth century. PAUL GRÜNBERG.

11. Cooperating Forces.

II. Pietism at Halle: A new epoch in the development of Pietism was marked when, for a time, the University of Leipsic closed its doors to the movement, whereupon the theological faculty of the newly founded University of Halle was filled, under Spener's influence with men of his own type. From the first the dominant spirit was August Hermann Francke (q.v.), who, though professor of Hebrew and Greek in the philosophical faculty until 1698, immediately began to lecture on exegesis. His colleagues were Joachim Justus Breithaupt, Johann Wilhelm Baier, Paul Anton, Johann Heinrich Michaelis, Joachim Lange (qq.v.), and Johann Daniel Hernschmied. The university was also profoundly affected by Francke's establishment of the famous Halle orphan asylum and affiliated schools and institutions. Many students of theology here received not only support, but preparation for their studies; the publishing house facilitated the literary propagation of Halle's cause; the collegium orientale afforded opportunity for linguistic training; and in the infirmary attached to the orphan asylum the medical faculty found compensation for the lack of a university clinic. Since Francke was both the dominant power in the faculty and the director of the orphan asylum, the former organization soon became so closely bound up with the interests and aims of these various institutions that the Halle phase of Pietism derived its peculiar nature from this very combination. This state of affairs was undeniably advantageous in many ways to the faculty, which gained prestige from the growing recognition of Francke's organizations, while the number of theological students at Halle rapidly increased; though, at the same time, these very factors caused a decided loss of independence and freedom of action in the faculty

1. Prestige of Francke and his Institutions.

In its command of an assured position, the Halle school of Pietism quickly assumed the aggressive, and deemed itself called to be the censor of divergent tendencies, views, and modes of life. This attitude rendered it still more difficult for its opponents to recognize its good intent, and contributed much to the degeneration of the controversies into personal animosities to the prejudice of real explanation and mutual understanding. This turn of events was the more unhappy since even without them the mass of conflicting elements would have resulted in open rupture. In 1698 strife broke out between Francke and the clergy of Halle, followed by a series of clashes between the theological faculty and the law professor, Christian Thomasius (q.v.), who had enthusiastically espoused the cause of Francke at Leipsic, all these controversies, however, being eclipsed by the attitude of the theological faculty toward their colleague, the philosopher Christian Wolff, who was deposed from his office by King Frederick William I. (see WOLFF, CHRISTIAN, AND THE WOLFFIAN THEOLOGY). Of still greater moment were the literary battles between Pietism and its opponents outside of Halle. The most significant of these was the Wittenberg theological professor Valentin Ernst Löscher (q.v.), with his *Vollständiger Timotheus Verinus* (Witten-

2. Unsuccessful War on Pietism.

berg, 1718). Löscher was no fanatical assailant of Pietism; he recognized some good in the movement, and by a threefold classification of its adherents (the Halle Pietists being reckoned as midway between the radical and conservative wings) he sought to do justice to its several gradations. At the same time, his estimate of conversion, his concept of the pastoral office, and his stress on pure doctrine rested on a theological basis so wholly and fundamentally at variance with that of the Halle school that the harmony which he desired proved impossible, despite long correspondence and a personal interview with Francke and Hernschmied in May, 1719. The orthodox Lutheran attacks on Pietism, however, neither distracted the Pietists from their cause nor checked its wider development. Francke's educational institutions grew and multiplied; the Canstein Bible Institute was founded (see CANSTEIN, KARL HILDEBRAND, BARON VON); union was effected with the Danish mission in Tranquebar; and Francke also found time to interest himself in behalf of the captive Swedes in Siberia. His death, in 1727, was a serious loss for his faculty, which soon was greatly changed.

Many of the institutions and organizations created by the Pietism of Halle exercised a deep influence on the Lutheran Church in Germany. Even before Francke's death, however, the movement had reached its zenith; and it had only been his powerful, energetic, and influential personality which had, in many ways, lessened the dangers of one-sidedness and extravagance in Pietism at Halle, and kept its darker side comparatively inconspicuous. At the same time, the flaws in the movement did not originate altogether in the second generation, but were innate in the Halle type of Pietism from the first.

3. One-Sided Nature of the Movement.

One obvious characteristic of the movement at Halle was its lack of appreciation of the diversity and wealth of development in the growth of piety. "Conversion," as Francke experienced it, was not viewed in the light of an individual phenomenon, but as the normal way to salvation, regardless of other experiences taught by the history of the religious life. The question then arose as to the distinguishing marks of real conversion, and whether this must include a conviction of sin and the experience of ictic conversion at a precise moment. The affirmation of these demands also afforded a standard for gaging the Christianity of others; and in applying this the Pietists of Halle were no very lenient judges where they lighted upon the "unconverted." Their one-sided insistence on the religious tone in education was not above criticism, admirable as were the results which it produced, for in some cases it was the cause of spiritual pride, and in others of hypocrisy. Francke, himself, however, in his inculcation of intense Christianity, clearly recognized the claims of practical life. Among the subjects of instruction he included botany, zoology, mineralogy, anatomy, physics, and astronomy, as well as such mechanical crafts as turning and glass-grinding, thus preparing the way for the modern trade schools. But notwithstanding all this breadth of judgment, which Francke also evinced in many other directions, he was strangely ignorant of the needs and feelings of the young. The incessant surveillance of the pupils in all of his institutions clogged the development of independence and was an obvious pedagogical error; and the same statement holds true of the restriction of harmless amusements.

4. Effect on Theological Study.

The practical religion taught by the Pietism of Halle exerted a significant influence upon the attitude of the university toward technical theology. Since Francke was convinced that living faith and sincere conversion were indispensable postulates to a knowledge of God, independent value was denied mere intellect, and the entire curriculum of studies was arranged accordingly. First of all, the development of personal religion was furthered; all academic lectures assumed the character of devotional sessions and revival sermons; every lecture was opened and closed with prayer. In addition to all this, the faculty met twice each week at the dean's house, where the students had to report on their studies and receive advice. The study of the Bible in the original was the center of the entire course. The darker side of this concept of theology, however, was shown in the Halle faculty's unproductiveness in the field of strict scholarship. Francke's own ability for scientific activity was undeniable, but he was far too much engrossed by his institutions to have time for research, though he never felt that this curtailed his efficiency as a teacher. There was, however, no perception of the fact that the new foundation of theology upon conversion and the edifying study of Scripture needed to be harmonized with orthodox theology, or that the entire body of systematic theology must be reconstructed, any more than there was recognition of the desirability of reaching a scholarly understanding with extremists in the Pietistic camp itself and with the Wolffian philosophy. Since these problems lay within the scope of the faculty's duties, the fact that they were ignored was an act of remissness that brought speedy vengeance. The faculty grew torpid and, after the death of Francke, lost its influence over the student body.

II. Pietism in Württemberg: The entrance of Pietism into Württemberg was particularly momentous for the subsequent development of the movement, since it there not only attracted many adherents, but also acquired a distinct character which was both independent of Spener and sharply distinguished from the Halle and Moravian Pietistic types. The movement received its first incentives in Württemberg from Spener himself, who visited Stuttgart in May, 1662, and later spent four months in Tübingen. Not only were the general conditions of religious life in Württemberg favorable for the growth of Pietism, but special welcome seems to have been accorded it because of contemporary political burdens, which rendered men more open to the preaching of a gospel of the heart. The movement was also aided by the fact that the princes of the land did not oppose it; while it received direct encouragement from the Church authorities, who had early begun to turn Spener's views to practical account in favor of true Chris-

1. Pietism Cordially Welcomed.

tian life. The influence of the Halle Pietist was very evident in the efforts to raise the standard of theological education; and as early as 1694 an edict was issued declaring that even a comprehensive theological training did not lead to a true knowledge of God if the heart clung to the world, and urging professors to educate not only learned, but devout and godly men. At Stuttgart the consistory successfully sought to obviate conflicts with Pietism on Württemberg soil; the controversial *Considerationum theologicarum decas* of the Tübingen professor Michael Müller was confiscated; and on Feb. 28, 1694, appeared an edict joyfully hailed by Spener for, while assuming the inviolable validity of the symbolical books and the existing agenda, it conceded a whole series of details to Pietism. There was, however, no uniform attitude on the part of the ecclesiastical authorities toward private devotional meetings, which had become popular in Württemberg as early as the ninth decade of the seventeenth century. Where these meetings lacked clerical direction, they were at first partly forbidden; and it was only long afterward, in consequence of the organization of *collegia pietatis* by some lecturers at Tübingen in 1703, that the conventicles were regularly sanctioned, though even then it was desired that they be held in the churches. Moreover, this favorable disposition of the consistory had reference only to that section of Pietism which continued strictly within the bounds of the Church and did not favor the separatistic tendencies to which Württemberg was peculiarly predisposed.

2. Separatism and Tübingen Influence.

The early stages of Pietistic separatism may be traced back to the initial stages of the movement itself. It found particular support among clergymen of marked devoutness and gravity, and firmly ensconced itself in various places, including the country districts. The conflict with this growing separatism was opened by the Edict of 1703; a second edict, forbidding all conventicles held by sectaries, followed in 1706; and the third, or general, rescript of Mar. 2, 1707, added certain drastic measures, threatening to banish those separatists who should refuse to attend Church and communion within three months. This course was abandoned, however, in a few years, so that the decree of Jan. 14, 1711, showed a milder attitude toward the separatistic Pietists. It came to be more and more the practise to abandon all forcible measures in the case of such separatists as behaved themselves quietly, until finally the general rescript of Oct. 10, 1743, permitted all private devotional meetings that did not involve breach of the peace. This leniency toward the separatists, which was in sharp contrast to North German practise of the period, became possible since it involved no danger to the Church, and since there was no contentious orthodoxy to misconstrue its spirit. At the same time, this policy prevented the Church from putting down separatism, which persisted throughout the eighteenth century and broke out afresh at its close.

Lastly, the attitude of the University of Tübingen was important for implanting Pietism in Württemberg. While the influence of Tübingen's theological faculty upon this development was far from equal to that of Halle, nevertheless, the plan of filling professorships with men who took their inspiration from Spener showed its practical effects in more ways than mere modification of the aims and methods of instruction. Besides Johann Wolfgang Jäger, who imparted a new spirit to the faculty, the teaching force included Johann Christian Pfaff, Andreas Adam Hochstetter, Christoph Reuchlin, and Christoph Eberhard Weismann. The Pietism evolved under these conditions showed certain distinctive features. Its adherents were predominantly among the clergy, among the middle classes in the towns, and in the rural districts; not, as with Pietism in North Germany, among the nobility. This insured a far more popular character for the movement, so that Pietistic *Stunden*, or prayer-meetings, have survived to the present time. On the other hand, the Württemberg phase of Pietism preserved the church ideal more largely than was the case at Halle, this attitude doubtless being strengthened by the moderate and reasonable course adopted by the ecclesiastical authorities, as well as by the absence of a contentious type of orthodoxy. In Württemberg, moreover, Pietism enjoyed a distinct advantage through its intimate sympathy with scientific theology, the resultant combination being shown, for example, by the New-Testament critic and exegete Johann Albrecht Bengel (q.v.), who constantly sought to unite the two. In view of the influence exercised by Pietism on the life of the Church in Württemberg this attitude toward scientific method was not without moment for theology; and its influence on Pietism itself was still more profound, since it served to maintain its intellectual mobility, and fostered that spirit of independence and self-restraint which preserved it from the decline which overtook the movement at Halle. Finally, Württemberg Pietism was characterized by a range and scope of religious life far wider and more diverse than the stereotyped form of the movement which prevailed at Halle; and while it is not always easy precisely to define the new elements introduced by Swabian individualism, it is certain that there were many direct points of contact between the Swabian movement and the Pietism of Halle.

3. Attitude toward Moravians.

Though Württemberg never became entirely independent of Halle, a distinct sense of the divergence between the two schools was eventually evolved. This became clear in the position taken by the Württemberg Pietists with regard to the Moravians. Count Nicholas Louis von Zinzendorf (q.v.) exercised a considerable influence from the time of his first visit in 1729, and induced many young theologians to enter the Moravian communion. Nevertheless, he was denied the fruit of great and permanent results, since men like Georg Konrad Rieger, and especially Bengel (qq.v.), who disapproved the formation of independent congregations, Count Zinzendorf's personality, and many other things, opposed the further inroads of Moravianism. Yet though they thus blocked its advance in Württemberg, this rebuff did not entirely break off friendly relations with the Unity of the Brethren, with whom harmony is still preserved, chiefly

because of Lutheran appreciation of Moravian missionary activity. The third main division of Pietists was the Unity of the Brethren (q.v.), or Moravians, founded by Zinzendorf.

IV. The Spread of Pietism: Statistics of the spread of Pietism can scarcely be given with any approximation to completeness until preliminary studies, such as have already been begun, shall have been made of the history of the movement in the various localities in which it took root. Such studies, moreover, would doubtless aid in distinguishing the frequently interchanging tendencies proceeding from Herrnhut and Halle respectively. Spener himself, like Francke, sought to find interests in common with other religious bodies and leaders, while Zinzendorf surpassed them both in this regard. The triumph of Pietism over all obstacles, and its spread not only throughout Germany, but even into Switzerland, Holland, England, Denmark, and Russia, was partly due to the wide-spread indifference toward dogmatic formulas that had been discredited through theological wrangling, though it owed its real success to the fact that it was able to offer something not then supplied by the State churches. In addition to preaching, the personal association that was facilitated by the private devotional meetings, and an extensive correspondence dating from the time of Spener, the spread of Pietism was furthered by the influence exerted in filling pastorates and professorships with men sympathetic with the movement. This was particularly the case at Halle, which had a thousand theological students about 1730, while in 1729 an edict of Frederick William I. required all candidates for the ministry in his dominions to study there for two years. The university, therefore, together with Francke's institutions in Halle, developed a powerful influence in behalf of Pietism up to the middle of the eighteenth century; and Francke's journey to South Germany in 1718 still further promoted the cause.

V. The Nature and Significance of Pietism: The wide diversity of opinion, even at the present time, regarding Pietism is due not only to the fact that the movement, as a peculiar concept of Protestant Christianity, is naturally judged according to the dogmatic position of each individual critic, but also to the very nature of the Pietistic tendency. The mere question of authoritative sources for a determination of the essence of Pietism involves great difficulties, since the movement produced neither official doctrinal writings nor any principles which, when acknowledged everywhere and at all times, should constitute regular affiliation with the Pietist cause. The sole recourse, therefore, is to the private literature of the movement, which is predominantly devotional. It must, however, be used with caution because of its subjective, transient tone, which is shared by its opponents as well; and purely biographical sources are lamentably scanty. Moreover, Pietism embraced very heterogeneous phenomena, so that it assumed extremely divergent phases in different individuals living at the same time but in different regions, with different antecedents, and under different conditions. It likewise underwent the most diverse combinations, to say nothing of the variations which distinguished the chief phases of the movement from each other, or of the development which each of these phases worked out independently.

1. Complexity of Pietism.

Claiming possession of pure doctrine, the right administration of the sacraments, and a well-organized establishment as a national Church, Lutheranism had embarked upon a course of development during the seventeenth century in which, though the Bible was recognized as the sole authority and as the first and highest source of knowledge, its essential content was held to be summarized and contained in definitive dogmas. Where these boons and institutions were unmutilated, the Church professed to supply such a degree of perfection as obviated the necessity of any further development, whether inward or outward. The sole requirements laid upon church-members, accordingly, were recognition of the doctrine of the Church as an authoritative presentation of divine revelation, reception of the proffered Word and sacraments, and obedience to the several ordinances affecting church life. In opposition to this institutional Christianity of the Lutheran Church, which assumed to stand for evangelical Christianity while actually permitting the spiritual life to languish, Pietism emphasized the duty of striving after personal and individual religious independence and collaboration, and declared that religion is something altogether personal, that evangelical Christianity is present only when and in so far as it is manifested in Christian conduct. In the nature of the case, this assertion of the right and of the necessity of personal Christianity implied no attack upon any special doctrines or institutions of the Church, but was rather a protest against Lutheran absolutism. Notwithstanding this, Pietism assumed many phases on the basis of accentuation of personal Christianity. With Spener and Francke, the core of religious life was a firm faith in Providence. The clergy whose training was received at Halle laid the chief stress on conversion. Another principle widely diffused, especially in Moravian circles, was deep love for Jesus, this leading to a revival of the well-known ideals of medieval mysticism. All Pietistic trends and types, moreover, found a common bond in their tendency to seek the normal realization of living piety in a life of intense religious emotion, and to give a permanent place to the keen realization of individual sinfulness and guilt.

2. Lutheran Orthodoxy and Pietism.

Pietistic devotion achieved great and successful results, which were well merited in so far as the movement represented a justifiable reaction against an exaggerated ecclesiasticism. On the other hand, it was unconscious of the dangers attending its championship of the rights of individual personalities. In proportion as the experience of regeneration was exalted, the more expedient it seemed to produce, or at least to facilitate, this event by systematic courses of action. But the assumption that religious development was essentially fulfilled in the sphere of religious emotion prepared

3. Disadvantages of Pietism.

the way for an artificial excitation of this feeling, thus involving the danger of insincerity, self-deception, and sentimentalism, which, in the absence of self-discipline and sobriety, formed an easy transition to still worse aberrations. The extreme importance attached to individual experiences and to spontaneous prayer led to a communicativeness often hard to distinguish from loquacity. Moreover, those who underwent no such experiences came to be regarded with disdain by others. It is significant that Alberti, at Leipsic, early reproached the Pietists with self-complacency; and the thought of standing in a peculiarly intimate relationship to God was by no means unusual in Pietism at Halle. These principles were also adopted and amplified by the Moravians, or Unity of the Brethren. This attitude, which was the chief factor in estranging non-Pietistic from Pietistic circles, may seem to contradict the facts that Pietism was characterized by anxiety and depression, that it was cankered with introspection, that it never attained to inward rest, that one "awakened" must ever be awakened anew, and that he sought for indications of the grace which he had received, but enjoyed his prize only occasionally. Yet the contradiction is merely apparent, for the attitude in question was the necessary consequence of the dominating Pietistic consciousness of sin. It was, in other words, the result of an exclusively transcendental concept of the theory of blessedness, which in turn explains why Pietism looked so radically askance upon the world.

4. Influence on the Church.

By strongly emphasizing personal Christianity in the cultivation and development of pastoral care Pietism supplied abundant and momentous incentives which were heartily welcomed by Lutheran orthodoxy. The desire to unite the clergy more closely, and thus to facilitate an exchange of professional experiences, led Johann Adam Steinmetz, then general superintendent of the archdiocese of Magdeburg, to organize pastoral conferences in 1737; while by the systematic diffusion of devotional treatises he opened new ways for religiously influencing the masses. The fact that Johann Kaspar Schade's formal protest against the compulsory introduction of private confession was so thoroughly approved by the elector of Brandenburg that he abandoned the usage in 1698 (his example being followed by other State churches) was the result of serious disorders in the practical working of the system, though voluntary private confession still prevailed widely. The victorious advance of Pietism was also bound to affect public worship, which, as part of a State institution, enjoyed such protection in various districts that neglect of it might be punished by fines and other legal means. Not only was the mere existence of private devotional gatherings prejudicial to the position of authority enjoyed by the Church, but she was also obliged to find that the Pietistic emphasis on personal Christianity acted to the detriment of her liturgy. Nevertheless, while Pietism succeeded in making the entire Bible available for homiletic purposes, as contrasted with the compulsory pericopes, the movement failed to produce an epoch in the history of German preaching. It was, on the other hand, conspicuously successful in the sphere of hymnology, for which it was peculiarly qualified because of its cultivation of the emotional side of religion and its tenderness and warmth of religious expression. Though most of the hymns that emanated from Pietistic circles were pitched in too subjective, and even unwholesome and sentimental, a strain to be suitable for congregational use, some of the Pietist composers, such as Johann Jakob Schütz, Johann Anastasius Freylinghausen, Johann Jakob Rambach, Carl Heinrich von Bogatzky, Ernst Gottlieb Woltersdorf, Philipp Friedrich Hiller, and Nicholas Louis von Zinzendorf, have won a secure place in Lutheran hymnals; and not only did the wealth of poetry produced by Pietism exercise a profound influence in the furtherance of its own extension, but it also stimulated religious poetry beyond the circle of its own adherents.

5. Religious Training and the Bible.

In his high appreciation of religious and moral training for the people through the channel of religious instruction Spener followed the lines laid down by Luther in his catechisms, and especially advanced the task undertaken by Duke Ernest I. of Saxe-Gotha in the middle of the seventeenth century. It was owing to his efforts, indeed, that an electoral ordinance of Feb. 24, 1688, provided for the holding of weekly catechetical examinations for children and adults alike throughout the country; and it is not improbable that Spener was the ultimate inspiration of the Prussian electoral edict of 1692 requiring Sunday catechization in the rural congregations. Spener's purpose was the inward assimilation of religious truth rather than mere imparting of knowledge; and his efforts to advance practical piety among the masses were intimately associated with his interest in confirmation, which became an integral part of the usage of the Lutheran Church largely through the cooperation of Pietism. Still more eventful than Spener's energy, however, was the educational activity of Francke.

One of the main characteristics of Pietism was the fact that it claimed to be founded exclusively on the Bible. This might seem to be a mere repetition of the assertions of Lutheranism from the very first, but Pietism showed its independence of Lutheran orthodoxy both in its unswerving return to the Bible and in its application of Scriptural truths. The Lutheran Church was bound, as Pietism was not, by the creeds in which it had summarized its understanding of the Bible, and which it regarded as authoritative. The Pietistic reestablishment of the authority of the Bible was, therefore, a direct return to one of the cardinal principles of the German Reformation, and by granting the "awakened" Christian full capacity for independent study of the Bible Pietism restored to laymen the right which they had lost. Accordingly, Francke insisted that even children should read the Bible and made Biblical history a theme of study at school; while for the same reason he sought to gain wide circulation for the Bible, especially through the Canstein Bible Institute at Halle. On the other hand, Pietism impaired the salutary fea-

tures of this return to the Bible when it ignored the influence of the facts and conditions of history in its system of exegesis. The result was unbridled subjectivism; the Bible became a magical book from which prognostications and counsels were sought; the gloomy views on the conditions prevailing in the Church and the world turned men's thoughts to the future and gave the prophecies and apocalyptic writings a preeminence which fostered only too well the Pietistic tendency toward fanaticism.

6. Effect on Theology and Union.

While the practical character of Pietism forbids it to be considered a theological movement, it did not preclude points of contact with scientific theology. Unfortunately for both sides, however, these were predominantly antithetic; yet at the same time the development of Pietism had two results which were widely welcomed. In the first place, it became clear that the official Church and theology were not so deeply implanted among the people as had been supposed; and the recognition of this fact involved the task of seeking closer touch with the needs and longings of the time. Furthermore, by unsettling post-Reformation scholasticism and combating excessive appreciation of the creeds, Pietism cleared the way for new theological investigation in which the Bible was made the first field of labor, while the presentation of new points of view supplied corresponding problems for solution. The fact that even these incentives produced no marked change in theology, but served only as a preliminary for its revival in the nineteenth century, was due not only to immobility and want of receptivity on the part of the orthodox theology of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, but also, in great measure, to the Pietistic lack of appreciation of the nature and import of learning, its failure to perceive the concept and task of theology apart from preaching, and its absence of conscious need of exact formulation.

When Pietism once came to power, it renounced the claims to freedom which it had once emphasized, and rapidly declined into externalism and torpidity. The movement undoubtedly resulted in a considerable depreciation of dogma and dogmatic documents; for though they were not explicitly assailed, the stress laid by Pietism on Christian life and its use of the Bible deprived dogma of the preeminence which it had formerly enjoyed. The practical effect of this process appeared in a change of view regarding the relation of the Lutheran to the Reformed Church. It was obvious that living, personal Christianity was not confined to the membership of the Lutheran Church; but, this being so, both denominations were fundamentally equal. This disregard of sectarian distinctions was actually realized by Pietism when it was confronted with the task of founding a new church, the Unity of the Brethren. In this case, the first attempt at union was successful; though there is no doubt that other factors besides Pietism entered into the formation of the Moravian communion. It was undeniable, moreover, that the excessive stress of Pietism on personal religion might possibly lead to a depreciation of the differences separating Protestantism and Roman Catholicism, a tendency which might have found some support in certain aspects of the Halle system of education, in specific forms of Pietistic mysticism, and in much that is reported of Zinzendorf. Pietism did not, however, yield to this allurement, but adhered to its essentially Protestant character. Spener was an uncompromising foe of the Roman Catholic Church. In 1676 he urged the elector to make no concession to the pope; the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685 called forth his unsparing condemnation; and the attempts of Cristoval Rojas de Spinola (q.v.) to unite Protestants and Roman Catholics received no sympathy from him. In 1694, as the spokesman of the Berlin clergy, he discussed the method of most effectually resisting all overtures of the Roman Catholic Church, and his entire attitude toward the Latin communion was too intensely bitter to permit him to be suspected of any pro-Roman tendency. The example of Spener was followed in general by both the Halle and the Württemberg phases of Pietism; and though the age of orthodoxy witnessed many conversions from the Lutheran to the Roman Catholic Church, Pietism was responsible for none of them. It was not until toward the close of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century, when the Enlightenment had dulled sectarianism, that Pietists began to fraternize with Roman Catholics of similar tendencies.

7. Forerunner of Religious Freedom.

By weakening the antagonism that had previously existed between the Lutherans and the Reformed, Pietism became the vehicle of an idea which, when realized, produced far-reaching results. While the concept of freedom in faith and conscience did not attain full clearness and expression until the nineteenth century, Pietism was an important factor in this development; and to that movement was mainly due the wide diffusion of the conviction that it had become necessary to break with the restrictions on religious freedom contained in the treaties of Augsburg and Westphalia. Pietism likewise fought against the external constraint which it encountered from both Church and State because of the establishment, and secured legal sanction for its own organizations; and though this was but an isolated violation of the maxim that the State had the right of forcible intervention in case of deviation from the State Church, this infringement of the principle of territorialism marked a distinct advance toward complete emancipation from the medieval concept of religious compulsion.

8. Conventicles and Lay Cooperation.

Yet another constituent force in Pietism was its union of its adherents into a life of intimate religious fellowship. The formation of circles of this type began the Pietistic movement under Spener, and in Württemberg they developed into lasting institutions. Wherever Halle's influence reached, such meetings were organized; and Zinzendorf's entire activity was subservient to the fellowship ideal. Pietism, therefore, fought unceasingly for the privilege of private assembly, and its opponents rightly deemed its con-

venticles one of the most important manifestations of its peculiar genius. The diversity in the outward form of these conventicles, however, indicates that the movement sought merely to adapt given conditions to the practical development of active religious intercommunication, with scant regard to external organization as an end in itself. In forming his *collegia pietatis* Spener took his stand on the doctrine of the universal priesthood, a theory which Luther had opposed to the Roman Catholic distinction between clergy and laity, and which Lutheranism had never renounced. The tenet had, however, received no practical application, for the old twofold classification of Christians had still continued, except that the laity were now subjected to temporal rulers and theologians instead of being guided by bishops and priests. It was, then, only the revival of a fundamental idea of the Reformation when Pietistic conventicles procured for every Christian the right and opportunity of testifying to his experience in free address and free prayer. The enlistment of laymen for cooperation in the active work of the Church, moreover, meant the winning of new forces. This was a momentous advance, for though it was restricted chiefly to the "awakened," it still remained a vital force. The singleness of aim in the highest concerns of life and the mutual interest in common edification produced so close a bond of fellowship among Pietists that class distinctions of civil life either lost their significance or at least were much obscured. On the other hand, this very fact naturally afforded opportunities for base motives, as well as for vanity, greed, and hypocrisy; yet despite such abnormal phases of the movement, the increasing approximation of high and low on the basis of mutual religious edification at a time when such free contact was otherwise impossible exercised a noteworthy influence on social life. Spener clearly saw and boldly faced the evils arising from the fact that the government of the Church was exclusively in the hands of the secular rulers in various governments, and that the laity were excluded from it. He accordingly urged the appointment of lay elders to cooperate with the preachers. The plan of instituting presbyteries gained favor in Württemberg and was realized in the Moravian congregations. Nevertheless, Spener was unsuccessful in securing a general participation of the laity in the administration of the Church, for this was impossible unless the above-mentioned secular rulers should voluntarily curtail their prerogatives, a thing inconceivable in the eighteenth century. Furthermore, the formation of separatistic bodies for the realization of his ideals was as opposed to Spener's ecclesiastical mind as was the act of the Peace of Westphalia in granting toleration in Germany to those churches alone which were explicitly recognized by the treaty in question. But though Pietism found no way wholly to reconstruct the organization of the Church, the movement was not without significance in relation to subsequent efforts in this direction. There was a close affinity between Pietism and the chief exponents of Collegialism (q.v.), apparent, for instance, in the latter system's leading advocate, Christoph Matthäus Pfaff (q.v.), and also implied in the circumstance that both causes had their headquarters at Halle.

9. Separatistic Tendencies.

So far as the orthodox opponents of Pietism understood and recognized the revival of the theory of the universal priesthood, they considered its beneficent results to be far outweighed by accompanying dangers and disadvantages. A far more vulnerable point of attack, however, was the relation of Pietism to separatism. This tendency was entirely unintentional, and the Moravian branch of Pietism was the only one to form a separate communion. Yet even here both the attendant circumstances and the character which the sect assumed show that it was not a product of a separatistic spirit. On the other hand, it must be conceded that Pietism was peculiarly open to the charge of separatism; and the very fact that the adherents of the movement were not conventional in their bearing immediately aroused suspicion. Though the Pietists themselves denied that there was such a thing as "Pietism," the outsider noticed that the friends of the movement kept together and supported each other, that the sense of union with sympathizers in other localities was a living one, that the adherents of the cause evinced unusual energy in pursuit of their aims, and that they exercised a potent influence. In short, Pietism had become a "party" as early as 1691; and during its golden age at Halle it manifested every evil of factionalism: greed for power; one-sided condemnation of opponents; and failure to censure friends. It seemed, therefore, both consciously and distinctly a tendency toward separation from fellow Lutherans in religious and in social life; and the very fact that its measures were designed to further the religious interests of its adherents alone caused it to be suspected of tendencies toward separatism and even secession.

Not only did Pietism thus become a faction of Lutheranism, but it was also joined and besieged by many of separatistic tendencies. As an opposition movement it naturally possessed a strong attraction for all those elements which were dissatisfied with existing conditions in the Church. Here they looked for sympathy and shelter, doubtless hoping, at the same time, to make the Pietistic circles instrumental to their own aims. They were cordially welcomed, but Pietism had to atone for excessive leniency toward many an enthusiast and "prophet" of doubtful character or of radical views. This ambiguous attitude of Pietism toward radicalism and separatism naturally increased current mistrust of the movement, and explains why its opponents might honestly assume an actual agreement between the two groups. Pietism itself, moreover, became fruitful soil for separatist movements through its attacks on contemporary Church conditions, its conventicle system, and its predilection for chiliasm and the like. At the same time, a sharp distinction must be drawn between Pietism and separatism. The former sought to achieve its projects of reform inside the Lutheran Church, and took current dogma and recognized organization as its bases; while the latter had lost all hopes of the future of a Church which it assumed to

be moribund, and accordingly on principle took up a position outside the existing status of the Church.*

10. Rigid Austerity.

The chief characteristics of Pietism also include intense moral earnestness and the stern austerity that it sought to realize in practical life. The conditions which confronted it demanded a policy of energetic aggression. Morality was low, especially at the courts and among the nobility, and conditions in the middle classes and the peasantry were little better. The effects of the Thirty Years' War, which had shaken German civilization to its very foundations, were visible in immorality, luxury, riotous living, and contempt for the rights of others. How far Pietism effected the moral elevation of the masses must remain a problem until deeper researches shall have been made in the history of eighteenth-century Lutheranism, particularly with regard to the confessional. It is certain, however, that the adultery and drunkenness common among Lutheran pastors before the rise of Pietism were checked by it; and that it distinctly raised the moral tone of the Württemberg clergy. Its moral effect upon the nobility is equally demonstrable, even though its darker sides were shown at the court of more than one Pietistic count. The labors of Pietism were, therefore, by no means in vain.

Pietism not only combated worldliness, but viewed the world itself as a vast organism of sin which every "awakened" Christian must shun under jeopardy of salvation. This attitude, however, gave rise to controversy because of the demand of Pietism that public morality be transformed to accord with its peculiar tenets, so that the theater, dancing, cards, smoking, and jesting were not to be considered Adiaphora (q.v.), but must be avoided by the Christian as sins and abominations before God. This austerity came to prevail not only among the more humble adherents of the movement, but also among the Pietistic nobility, so that Henry II. of Reuss-Greitz even attempted, though with scant success, to give official recognition to these principles by a decree dated Sept. 17, 1717. Pietism itself, however, was unswerving in its attitude, and all its branches retained the conviction that the converted Christian must exercise renunciation regarding the points at issue. This position was deeply significant in the development of Pietism, for by shunning the world it was led to feel either no interest or an entirely inadequate interest in art, science, and secular culture. This aloofness involved the surrender of all real influence upon intellectual life in general; it forced Pietism into a position of isolation, and was also bound to restrict its religious and moral effects.

The final conspicuous attribute of Pietism was its practical benevolence, which led the movement into the midst of active life and made it the vehicle of an evangelical comprehensiveness hitherto unknown in Germany. The impulse to undertake such tasks was inherent in the nature of Pietism. Just as Luther had taught that good works must necessarily proceed from living faith, so the intense religious life of Pietism inspired its followers to share the blessings of their salvation with others, to testify to their faith, and to give proof of it by upright life and brotherly love. In harmony with this attitude they naturally sought out the wretched and the needy as proper objects of beneficence. Attention was given first to their own countrymen and was begun by Spener himself, who took an active part in building a combination of a poorhouse, orphan asylum, and workhouse at Frankfort in 1679. The importance of all this, however, was overshadowed by Francke's establishment of the orphan asylum at Halle in 1694. The new element in this event was the fact that one man alone, relying on divine help, should undertake to found such an institution on broad lines, and that it should be maintained by the voluntary contributions of a circle bound by mutual sympathy. Thus Pietism won the distinction of permanently pledging the Lutheran Church to works of active benevolence, so preparing the way for the ultimate establishment of the inner mission (see Innere Mission). The orphan asylum at Halle was also the point of departure for foreign missions, the second form of benevolent activity created by Pietism. Spener himself had had appreciation for this cause, though the actual bond between Pietism and missions was Francke. Through him Halle became the psychic center of the Danish mission, he supplied the missionaries that went to India, he founded the first German missionary journal, he raised money for missionary purposes, and he led Protestant Germany to include missions in its scope of activity. A distinct step in advance was made shortly afterward when Zinzendorf turned the attention of the Moravians to this field of labor, not only because the Moravians embodied an independent type, and were more adaptable than the Halle Pietists, but also because they struck into new paths, utilized the services of laymen, and as a church sent missionaries with astonishing rapidity to various parts of America and South Africa. Germany was led, therefore, to share in spreading Protestantism among non-Christian nations and peoples through the direct influence of Pietism; and since this movement controlled the mission work until late in the nineteenth century, the details of the system adopted clearly showed the peculiar genius of Pietism. Under Zinzendorf's direction, the Moravian type of missionary preaching, unlike that of the Danish and Halle mission, took the noteworthy course of preaching simply the Gospel of Christ, and not Lutheran dogma. It was, moreover, the interest of German Pietism in the diffusion of the Scriptures that led the missions to make the Bible accessible in translation to the Christian congregations among the heathen. The pioneer in this cause was Bartholomæus Ziegenbalg (q.v.) with his Tamil version of

11. Philanthropic and Missionary Activity.

* To those who do not regard separatism as an unmixed evil, but as a thing sometimes demanded by way of protest against intolerable State Church conditions, the above criticism will seem to lack force. If conditions in Germany in the seventeenth and the eighteenth century had made possible the rise of denominations, as in England, the religious life of the nation might have attained to and maintained a higher standard, and the triumph of rationalism in the Enlightenment (q.v.) might have been averted. A. H. N.

the Bible (Tranquebar, 1714–28). In certain respects, however, the adoption of Pietistic views worked unfavorably, as in the attempt to concentrate converts from paganism into small congregations analagous to the Pietistic circles within the Church at home. At the same time, extraordinarily strict rules were laid down regarding the admission of converts to the Church, and baptism was given only when conversion had been proved; while the same antipathy toward amusements and popular customs was manifested by the Pietists in the mission field as was shown by them in Germany. The Pietists were also lacking, to some degree, in proper self-restraint, as in their choice of fields of labor, the practise of drawing lots in connection with weighty decisions, and the sentimentalism characterizing many of their reports. Pietism also inaugurated systematic missions among the Jews. Spener had recognized the need of such missions and had done much to rouse interest in them. The Moravians also took an active part in this work through the aid of Samuel Lieberkühn, although their extensive foreign missions prevented them from applying their full energy to this difficult branch of Christian activity. On the other hand, an important center for these efforts was created by Pietism at Halle, where Johann Heinrich Callenberg (q.v.) founded, in 1728, an Institutum Judaicum, which continued in operation till 1792. Pietism likewise aided those who sympathized with its tenets, even though they were not within its own communion or in its own land. Zinzendorf found opportunity to intercede for the Protestants in Moravia; he protected the Schwenckfeldians who had fled from Saxony to America; and he made spiritual provision for the German emigrants to Pennsylvania.

12. Pietism and the Enlightenment.

The exact relation of Pietism to the Enlightenment (q.v.) is a problem which receives most divergent answers. Some declare that the two movements are absolutely antithetical, and others hold that the Enlightenment is a product of Pietism. In reality, however, the relation between these two trends was neither one of mere antithesis nor yet one of cause and effect. Though there were many fundamental deviations between Pietism and Enlightenment, such as the divergent attitudes toward revelation, the essence of piety, and the Bible, the two movements still had points in common, not only through such men as Christian Thomasius, Johann Christian Edelmann, and Johann Konrad Dippel (qq.v.), but also through their opposition to Lutheran orthodoxy, their insistence on the religious rights of individuals, and their practical Christianity. On the other hand, the theory that the Enlightenment was derived from Pietism is inadequate, for it assumes that those degeneracies and excrescences of the separatistic and radical forms of Pietism, which Pietism itself rejected as alien elements, must be regarded as characteristic features of the movement; and this hypothesis also overlooks the fact that the premises underlying Enlightenment were extremely manifold, and in their initial stages were far anterior to the rise of Pietism. Enlightenment and Pietism should rather be considered two distinct movements with a mutual goal in the destruction of clericalism, though diverging from each other in their subsequent evolution. At the same time, the sincerest Pietism indirectly aided the rapid growth of Enlightenment in Germany, not only, in its contempt for culture, by giving the younger generation no adequate training to cope with Enlightenment, but also, through its neglect of such education, by driving those of scholarly inclinations into the rationalistic camp.

13. Development and Origin.

It is extremely difficult to fix the precise limits of Pietism in point of time. Each of its chief phases passed through a distinct development and reached its climax at a different period. At Halle Pietism was on the decline by 1730; and when Francke died in 1769, the old position of Halle as the citadel of Pietism in central and northern Germany was practically lost. Württemberg Pietism never exercised such wide-spread influence as that of Halle, but on the other hand it enjoyed a tranquil and steady development; and it also had the advantage of not owing its prosperity to any one individual, so that the death of Bengel in 1769 had no such effect as that of Francke. By overcoming the "Storm and Stress period," which they styled their "winnowing-time," the Moravians had won such internal and external tenacity that the decease of Zinzendorf in 1760 no longer menaced their status, and August Gottlieb Spangenberg (q.v.) could begin his activity. When Valentin Ernst Löscher (q.v.), the famous opponent of Pietism, died in 1749, the Pietistic controversy had ceased to attract attention; the age of aggressive Pietism was past; its message to Protestantism had been delivered.

Great differences of opinion likewise prevail concerning the beginnings of Pietism. It is well known, however, that long before the time of Spener a reaction had begun against the ruling tendencies in the Church and in theology, as well as against their effect on Christian life. Yet despite all this, the Pietistic movement was adjudged by its own contemporaries to be something new, this view being justified by the fact that Pietism welded together the scattered projects of reform, deduced their practical conclusions, and endeavored to realize them. This was Spener's achievement, and in this sense he may be considered the founder of Pietism. The preparation for Pietism, like its history, shows clear analogies to similar phenomena within the Reformed Church; and long before Spener's movement the sects which had broken off from the Church of England had manifested a kindred spirit which exercised a marked influence on the continent, including Germany, through its rich devotional literature. In western Germany contact with the Reformed Church of Holland was an important factor. The Pietistic tendencies in the Reformed Church, which also appear in the Reformed phase of Protestantism in northern Germany, are in entire accord with Lutheran Pietism in their emphasis upon practical Christianity, their attitude toward the dominant orthodoxy of their time, and their tendency toward a closer union among the faithful. These points of agreement between Lutheran Pietism and its parallels on Reformed soil imply the existence of

an international movement, even as Enlightenment was later to pervade all Europe. Yet even though many an incentive may have reached Germany from the Puritans, the Labadists, and the Dutch, Pietism was essentially a German movement, not a product of foreign Calvinism.

VI. Later Development: Among the numerous and divergent factors which finally brought about the fall of Enlightenment, Pietism was one of the foremost. Though it could bring to bear neither theological nor philosophical learning, and though it was without influence either on great masses or on the rulers of Church and State, it at least possessed the power which is ever inherent in firm religious convictions and the inward strength of the Christianity for which it stood. Pietism thus became the center for multitudes of members of the State Church who had failed to find in the official clergy, dominated by Enlightenment, the aid to religion which they desired. The new movement, on the other hand, was able to give all who joined it a definite and inspiring aim in the propaganda for the old faith; and there accordingly arose a Pietistic reaction which, hidden at first, grew until it became a potent factor among the national, literary, theological, and ecclesiastical elements which combined for the spiritual and mental regeneration of Germany during the period of the Napoleonic wars. So powerful, indeed, was its influence that it was little less than that which had been exercised by the Pietism of the eighteenth century, even though the changed conditions of the times rendered its external forms less striking. The bond between the Pietism of the eighteenth and that of the nineteenth century was supplied by survivals of the older movement, by the Moravians, and by the *Christentumsgesellschaft* (see CHRISTENTUMSGESELLSCHAFT, DIE DEUTSCHE). From this latter organization German Lutheranism gained an assistance which marked an epoch in its history, especially in view of the foundation of the Basel Bible Society, the Basel Missionary Society, and other religious and philanthropic institutions. The Moravians, or Unity of the Brethren (q.v.), perhaps never exercised a greater influence upon German Protestantism than during the era of Enlightenment. The very remoteness of their settlements gave them protection against the tendencies of the age, and the further they progressed in their tranquil development, the greater was the confidence of others in their cause. Even in Zinzendorf's time auxiliary societies were formed in England and Holland for the support of their missionary labors, and they were aided by their friends in Germany, especially about the beginning of the nineteenth century, when "awakened" circles became filled with the missionary spirit. Zinzendorf also showed himself disposed to cultivate religious friendship with non-Moravian sympathizers, and from his tours for the furtherance of this end was developed missionary activity among the Lutheran Diaspora, the object being not secession from the State Church, but the formation of circles of Moravian sympathizers within it. In 1775 these affiliated adherents numbered 30,000. The revival type of preaching also renewed the conventicles of the older Pietism. In Württemberg, indeed, prayer-meetings had never lapsed entirely, but had been conducted chiefly by laymen until a number of pastors, among whom Ludwig Hofacker (q.v.) was prominent, likewise joined the movement. In 1828 the number of those attending conventicles was estimated at 30,000. Swabian Pietism was also powerfully aided by its close affiliations with the Basel Missionary Society, which still finds its chief subsidiary district in Württemberg, whence it is accustomed to call its leaders. So important a center as Basel was bound to affect all German Switzerland; Barbara Juliana von Krüdener (q.v.) gave some incentives of a transient kind in this region; and the "awakening" in French Switzerland likewise became a factor as it spread eastward. Besides Bern and Zurich, St. Gall may be noted as the center of a large Pietistic circle formed by the talented Agnes Schlatter. The revival in Bavaria found some Roman Catholic adherents, and Nuremberg also became a Pietistic focus, largely through the merchant Johann Tobias Kiessling. In Baden, the rise of Pietistic sentiment was observed from the time of the "famine years" 1816–17, and it made rapid progress after the union of 1821. In northern Germany, on the other hand, Pietism, except for small scattered groups, succumbed to Enlightenment; and even when this latter movement was approaching its end, the Pietistic cause had no firm hold that could be compared with Pietism in Württemberg. The Reformed Pietism of Rhenish Westphalia, however, experienced a powerful revival through Samuel Collenbusch, Johann Gerhard Hasenkamp, Friedrich Arnold Hasenkamp, Johann Heinrich Hasenkamp, Gottfried Menken, Friedrich Adolf Krummacher, and Gottfried Daniel Krummacher (qq.v.). At the same time the Lutherans at Elberfeld were headed by a pastor, Hilmar Ernst Rauschenbusch, who had been won for Pietism while a student at Halle; the valley of the Wupper remained one of Pietism's surest domains in the nineteenth century; and the movement even gained entrance at Berlin, a center of German Enlightenment, notably through the efforts of the Silesian Baron Ernst von Kottwitz (q.v.) and the preacher Johann Jänicke.

1. Factors and Growth.

It is even more difficult to define modern Pietism than the corresponding movement of the eighteenth century. It forms no organized ecclesiastical body; its individual groups have no fixed mutual relation; it has no distinct theological tendency; and large numbers of its adherents do not term themselves Pietists. The old Halle school of Pietism has entirely disappeared. The Moravians have formed a distinct church, and have so largely divested themselves of earlier Pietistic characteristics that only in a very limited sense can they now be considered Pietists. The Württemberg branch alone survives, but though it preserves most purely the connecting bond with early Pietism, the territorial limitations of its activity prevent it from serving as a standard to determine the nature of modern Pietism. The transfer of the term Pietism to phases of church life of the nineteenth century shows that the word has lost its original definiteness of meaning. In many instances the modern use of

2. Character of Modern Pietism.

the word indeed connotes ideas in harmony with the older Pietism; in other instances there are only slight suggestions of such affinities; and in yet other cases there are absolutely no points in common. The Pietism of the nineteenth century may, however, be defined as that tendency in German Protestantism which represents the devotional type of the older Pietism, as well as its views of life and its attitude toward the world, so that it may be regarded as a continuation of the earlier school. Nevertheless, only the fundamental ideas of primitive Pietism have been retained, for the revolutions in political, social, and ecclesiastical affairs have caused the movement to assume new forms and activities and to adopt new constituent elements. It thus implies a further stage of development and shows scarcely an instance of mere repetition. It no longer fosters religious life by prayer-meetings, but finds a wider sphere of activity in foreign and domestic missionary societies. A noteworthy characteristic of the revival period of the early nineteenth century was the sense of fellowship with similar circles within the Roman Catholic Church, while the two churches cooperated in Bible societies, but the rise of ultramontanism, after the second decade of the nineteenth century, ended further association, although in Pietistic circles the sentiment of spiritual affinity with kindred spirits in the sister church persisted long, and exercises some influence even at the present time. The syncretism of Pietism, moreover, in combination with the decay of denominational barriers during the period of the Enlightenment, rendered the movement as liable to sectarianism and separatism in the nineteenth century as it had been in the hundred years preceding; but, on the other hand, these dangers were lessened by the fact that the relations of the new Pietism to the Church and to orthodoxy experienced an essential transformation. Their united stand against their common foe rationalism produced close affiliations which outlasted the conflict. Pietism became reabsorbed in the Church, and orthodoxy grew susceptible to Pietistic modes of thought and feeling. This change in the situation of Pietism was essentially aided by the fact that the Church now accorded due recognition to practical benevolence both at home and in the foreign mission field. Since, however, Pietism had from the first laid special claim to these spheres of activity, the altered attitude of orthodoxy toward it was a distinct tribute to its ability and enabled it to retain all essentials of its missionary position. When, moreover, the Church developed an increasing interest in domestic and foreign missions, there was a marked augmentation both of the influence of Pietism and of the confidence shown it by orthodox circles.

3. Estimate of the Movement.

A comprehensive verdict on the significance of modern Pietism for German Protestantism, whether favorable or unfavorable, can not be given in a single sentence. It is a far more complex phenomenon than the older system, full of heterogeneous elements, and not only varying in different parts of the country and changing with the lapse of time, but also showing divergent phases in cities and in rural districts. In addition to its mission work, Pietism was an important factor in the religious revival of Germany during the first third of the nineteenth century, even though it was not the sole source of the movement. The enlargement of its sphere of activity and its coalescence with the State Church doubtless aided Pietism to escape from its conventicle-like bonds. On the other hand, its innate tendency toward small coteries, which cuts it off from all comprehension of the wealth of intellectual, national, and cultured life, prevents it from becoming a great popular movement; nor has it proved able to resist the tendency toward party schemes and uncharitable depreciation of those holding different opinions. The movement has recently been forced into a critical position by the rise of the modern associational tendency based on Anglo-American Methodism; for even though Pietism and Methodism were closely akin in origin, the tendency in question is directed toward ends which have no reference to Pietism. CARL MIRBT.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A. Ritschl, *Geschichte des Pietismus*, Bonn, 1884–86; J. G. Walch, *Einleitung in die Religionsstreitigkeiten der evang.-lutherischen Kirche*, 5 vols., Jena, 1730–39; F. W. Berthold, in *Raumers historischen Taschenbuch*, 3 ser., iii. 131–320, iv. 171–390, Leipsic, 1852–53; M. Göbel, *Geschichte des christlichen Lebens in der rheinisch-westfälischen Kirche*, vols. ii.–iii., Coblenz, 1852–60; A. Tholuck, *Der Geist der lutherischen Theologen Wittenbergs . . des 17. Jahrhundertes*, Hamburg, 1852; W. Gass, *Geschichte der protestantischen Dogmatik*, ii. 374–449, Berlin, 1857; H. Schmid, *Die Geschichte des Pietismus*, Nördlingen, 1863; H. L. J. Heppe, *Geschichte des Pietismus und der Mystik in . der Niederlande*, Leyden, 1879; W. Bender, *Johann Konrad Dippel, Der Freigeist aus dem Pietismus*, Bonn, 1882; F. Nippold, *Zur Vorgeschichte des Pietismus*, in *TSK*, 1882, pp. 347–392; idem, *Handbuch der neuesten Kirchengechichte*, iii. 114 sqq., iv. 173 sqq., Berlin, 1901; E. Sachsse, *Ursprung und Wesen des Pietismus*, Wiesbaden, 1884; L. Renner, *Lebensbilder aus der Pietistenzeit*, Leipsic, 1886; G. Freytag, *Bilder aus der deutschen Vergangenheit*, vols. iii.–iv., Leipsic, 1888; J. H. Kurtz, *Church History*, pp. 159, 162, 176, New York, 1890; W. Hübner, *Der Pietismus*, Zwickau, 1901; C. Kolb, *Die Anfänge des Pietismus und Separatismus in Württemberg*, Stuttgart, 1902; T. Kolde, in *Beiträge zur bayerischen Kirchengeschichte*, viii. 266–283, Erlangen, 1902; J. Batteiger, *Der Pietismus in Bayreuth*, Berlin, 1903; J. Jungst-Stettin, *Pietisten*, Tübingen, 1906; H. Stephan, *Der Pietismus als Träger des Fortschritts*, Tübingen, 1908; W. G. Goeters, *Die Vorbereitung des Pietismus in der reformierten Kirche der Niederlande*, Leipsic, 1909; Troltsch, *Leibniz und die Anfänge des Pietismus*, ed. C. Werckshagen, i. 366–375, Berlin, n.d.; the literature under FRANCKE, AUGUST HERMANN; KRUEDENER, BARBARA JULIANA VON; especially that under MYSTICISM; SPENER, PHILIPP JAKOB; and THOMASIUS, CHRISTIAN; and the works on the church history of the period.

PIETRO MARTIRE VERMIGLI. See VERMIGLI.

PIGHIUS, pi-gî'ʊs, **ALBERTUS (ALBERT PIGGHE):** Dutch Roman Catholic controversialist; b. at Kampen (9 m. n.n.w. of Zwolle) c. 1490; d. at Utrecht Dec. 26, 1542. He studied philosophy and mathematics at the University of Louvain and completed his theological studies at the University of Cologne in 1517. He was canon (1524–35) and provost (1535–42) at the Church of St. John the Baptist, Utrecht. Pope Hadrian VI. called him to Rome in 1523 and he took part in the diets of Worms and Regensburg, the issue of which were his publications: *Controversiarum præcipuarum* (Cologne, 1541); *Ratio componendorum dissidiorum* (1542); and *Apologia adversus M. Buceri* (Mainz, 1543). Pighius was one of the most resolute defenders of

the papacy, and in his comprehensive principal work, *Hierarchiæ ecclesiasticæ assertio* (Cologne, 1538), he unfolded most conclusively the papal system from a substructure involving a critical survey of the sources of Christian truth. He was the first to make tradition a basis of knowledge alongside of Scripture, in order to cut off Protestant argument in advance. On the other hand, his zeal of argument almost betrayed him as an unconscious disciple of Protestantism. The freedom of the will he asserted to such an extent, in *De libero hominis arbitrio* (1542), that original sin seemed to him scarcely as actual corruption but rather the imputation of the sin of Adam. This view carried with it the consequence of regarding justification as the imputation of the righteousness of Christ.

(E. F. Karl Müller.)

Bibliography: Bayle, *Dictionary*, iv. 637–641; A. Schweizer, *Die protestantischen Centraldogmen*, i. 180 sqq., Zurich, 1854; Linsenmann, in *TQ*, 1866, pp. 571 sqq.; K. Werner, *Geschichte der apologetischen und polemischen Litteratur*, iv. 241 sqq., 275 sqq., Schaffhausen, 1865; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, ix. 936 sqq.

PIGOU, pi-gū′, **FRANCIS:** Church of England; b. at Baden-Baden, Germany, of English parentage, Jan. 8, 1832. He was educated at Trinity College, Dublin (B.A., 1853), and was ordered deacon in 1855 and priested in the following year. He was curate of Stoke Talmage, Oxfordshire (1855–56), chaplain of Marbœuf Chapel, Paris (1856–58), curate of Vere Street Chapel, London (1858), and of St. Philip's, Regent Street, and St. Mary's, Kensington (1858–60), incumbent of St. Philip's (1860–1869), and served as vicar of Doncaster (1869–1875), being also rural dean of Doncaster after 1870; he was vicar of Halifax (1875–88), where he was likewise rural dean, and became dean of Chicester, a dignity which he held three years. Since 1891 he has been dean of Bristol, and was appointed a chaplain-in-ordinary to the queen in 1890. He is widely and favorably known as a missioner, and has held missions not only throughout England, but also in the United States, which he visited in 1885. His writings include *Faith and Practice* (sermons; London, 1865); *Early Communion Addresses* (1877); *Addresses to District Visitors and Sunday School Teachers* (1880); *Addresses delivered on various Occasions* (1883); *Manual of Confirmation* (1888); *Phases of my Life* (1898); *Odds and Ends* (1903); and *The Acts of the Holy Ghost. Thirty-two Years of Experience of Conducting Parochial Missions* (1908).

PILATE, ACTS OF. See Apocrypha, B, I., 7.

PILATE, PONTIUS: Known only as the fifth Roman procurator of Judea, under whose administration Jesus was executed. He probably succeeded Gratus 27 A.D. and ended his procuratorship early in 37; it is not likely that Pilate required more than a year for his return journey to Rome, whither he was summoned by Tiberius to give an account of his administration, and he arrived there after Tiberius' death, which took place Mar. 16, 37, and it appears that Vitellius, the legate of Syria, his accuser, was in Jerusalem in 36 as well as in 37, at the time of the Passover. Regarding the position of the procurator, see Governor. A copper coin struck in Cæsarea under Pontius Pilate is represented in *DB*, iii. 424–428. The judgment regarding Pilate's administration is chiefly based on the statements of Philo (*Legatio at Caium*, xxxviii.), who calls him inflexible and ruthless and reproaches him with venality, violence, peculation, ill-treatment, insult, the repeated infliction of punishment without trial, and with endless acts of cruelty—the well-known accusations brought by the Jews against every energetic Roman functionary. The only fact adduced by Philo, the setting up in the palace at Jerusalem of the golden shields dedicated to Tiberius, testifies only to the extreme sensitiveness of the Jews. Josephus (*War*, II., ix.; *Ant.*, XVIII., iii.–iv.) judges more indulgently, although he charges the procurator with introducing into Jerusalem banners bearing the emperor's image, and with using the funds of the temple for the construction of an aqueduct. The fact that Pilate energetically repressed every revolt is also proved by the massacre of the Galileans (Luke xiii. 1) and of the Samaritans (Josephus, *Ant.*, XVIII., iii. 1, iv. 1). It was on account of this latter act that Pilate was removed by Vitellius, who was very friendly toward the Samaritans as well as the Jews. It is quite natural that there were frequent disputes between the imperial procurator and the Jewish princes as to their respective fields of authority. Of the cause of the enmity between Pilate and Herod alluded to in Luke xxiii. 12, nothing is known. That Pilate was not an incompetent functionary is proved by the long duration of his rule under Tiberius.

In the trial of Jesus, Pilate acted from the standpoint of a functionary for whom public order was more important than the life even of an innocent man. According to Mark, the only question at issue was the confirmation of a sentence passed by the Sanhedrin. The fact that death occurred so quickly is the cause of his curiosity for the moment.

In Matthew and in Luke various points are added which bear an apologetic stamp; Pilate's wife and he himself acknowledge the innocence of Jesus. In John, where the main action of the trial is transferred from the Sanhedrin to the proceedings before Pilate, he becomes almost a mediator between Jesus and the Jews. Subsequently, along this apologetic tendency, the responsibility for the death of Jesus is more and more laid upon the Jews, and Pilate is made a witness to his innocence. Later Pilate is even represented as a Christian; the Copts and the Abyssinians rank him among the saints; and the Greeks do the same for his wife Prokla. In the third century arose the legend of Pilate's suicide under Caligula, of which Origen knows nothing. After the fourth century the estimation of Pilate, especially in the west, became more and more unfavorable; but recent historians have been more just in their treatment.

E. von Dobschütz.

Some interest attaches to the apocryphal account of the death of Pilate (Eng. transl., *ANF*, viii. 466–467). According to this the Emperor Tiberius was afflicted with a serious disease. Hearing that there was in Judea a wonderful physician who healed by power of a word, he sent to Pilate an order to have the physician come to Rome. To the messenger Pilate confesses that he has had the healer cru-

cified because he was a malefactor. The messenger in returning meets Veronica, who sends by him the miraculous handkerchief (see JESUS CHRIST, PICTURES AND IMAGES OF, III., 1, §§ 1–2), by which the emperor was healed. So Tiberius was enraged at Pilate and had him brought to Rome, but was restrained miraculously from upbraiding him by the fact that Pilate wore the seamless coat of Jesus. In a second interview, the anger of the emperor dissolved in the same unaccountable manner. By impulse or on advice, Tiberius had Pilate deprived of the coat and then sentenced him to the most disgraceful death possible. To avoid this, Pilate committed suicide. His body was weighted and sunk in the Tiber, but the demons which inhabited the body caused the water to boil as if in a storm. The body was then raised and sent to Vienne in France (etymologized as *Via Gehennæ*), where the phenomenon was repeated. The body was then sent to "Losania" (Lausanne or Lucerne?) and buried. Thus Pilate was brought into connection with Mont Pilatus, near Lucerne, the name of which is, however, rather to be derived from *Mons Pileatus*, "the hatted mountain," referring to the cloud cap which forms so often around the summit in midday.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: As sources, besides the references in the Gospels, consult: Philo, *Legatio ad Caium*, xxxviii.; Josephus, *War*, II., ix.; idem, *Ant.*, XVIII., iii.–iv.; and the apocryphal material with comment on it, as follows: J. C. Thilo, *Codex apocryphus N. T.*, i. 118–119, 487–488, Leipsic, 1832; C. Tischendorf, *Pilati circum Christum judicio quid lucis afferatur ex Actis Pilati*, Leipsic, 1855; idem, *Evangelia apocrypha*, ib. 1876; R. A. Lipsius, *Die Pilatus-Akten*, Kiel, 1871; Clemen, in *TSK*, 1894, pp. 759 sqq., F. C. Conybeare, in *Studia Biblica et ecclesiastica*, iv. 59–132, Oxford, 1896; Harnack, *Litteratur*, i. 21–24, 907–909, ii. 1, pp. 603–612; M. R. James, *Apocrypha Anecdota*, in *TS*, vol. ii.; E. Hennecke, *Handbuch zu den neutestamentlichen Apokryphen*, pp. 143 sqq., Tübingen, 1904; idem, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*, pp. 74–76, ib. 1904. Eng. transls. of the apocryphal material are in: *ANF*, viii. 416–467 (see APOCRYPHA, II., 7); *Acta Pilati*, ed. Geo. Sluter, Shelbyville, Ind., 1879; *Gesta Pilati: or the Reports, Letters and Acts of Pontius Pilate . . .*, ed. W. O. Clough, Indianapolis, 1880; *Apocryphal Gospels, Acts, and Revelations*, translated by A. Walker, pp. 125 sqq., Edinburgh, 1873; *Apocryphal New Testament*, pp. 50–79, Boston, n.d. Consult further: J. Langen, *Die letzten Lebenstage Jesu*, pp. 261–294, Freiburg, 1864; G. Warneck, *Pontius Pilatus der Richter Jesu Christi*, Gotha, 1867; G. A. Müller, *Pontius Pilatus der fünfte Prokurator von Judäa*, Stuttgart, 1888 (gives earlier literature); P. Waltjer, *Pontius Pilatus, eene Studie*, Amsterdam, 1888; A. Schaab, *Pontius Pilatus, ein Zeitbild*, Carlsruhe, 1892; T. Mommsen, *Römische Geschichte*, v. 508 sqq., Berlin, 1894; J. Stalker, *Trial and Death of Jesus Christ*, pp. 43 sqq., London, 1894; A. T. Innes, *Trial of Jesus Christ, a Legal Monograph*, Edinburgh, 1899; S. Mathews, *Hist. of N. T. Times*, 2d ed., New York, 1910; J. Belser, *Die Geschichte Leidens und Sterbens . des Herrn*, pp. 323–339, 346–372, Freiburg, 1903; G. Rosadi, *The Trial of Jesus*, London, 1905; *The Archko Volume*, transl. by McIntosh and Twyman, chap. viii., 2d ed., Philadelphia, 1905; Schürer, *Geschichte*, i. 487–492, Eng. transl., i. 2, pp. 81–86; *DB*, iii. 875–879; *EB*, iii. 3772–74; *DCG*, ii. 363–366; *JE*, x. 34–35; Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire*, part xxxii., columns 429–434; especially in the literature on the life of Christ the works of Keim, Holtzmann, Lange, Weiss, Stalker, Andrews, and Edersheim; also the commentaries on the Gospels, at the passages where mention of Pilate occurs.

PILGRIMAGES: Journeys to holy places for the sake of devotion and edification. They are a common feature of religious devotion, not peculiar to Christianity. In the last-named religion the custom began early. In the middle of the fourth century, after Constantine and his mother Helena had visited Golgotha, Bethlehem, and other places, and had built churches there, pilgrimages to the Holy Land became quite frequent. In the eighth century Charlemagne made a treaty with Haroun al Rashid to procure safety to the Christian pilgrims in Jerusalem, and founded a Latin monastery in that city for their comfort. In the eleventh century it was the outrages to which the Christian pilgrims were exposed in Palestine which, more than anything else, contributed to bring about the crusades. But in the mean time the Church had taken the matter in hand, and pilgrimages changed character. They became "good works," penalties by which gross sins could be expiated, sacrifices by which holiness, or at least a measure of it, could be attained. The pilgrim was placed under the special protection of the Church; to maltreat him, or to deny him shelter and alms, was sacrilege. And when he returned victorious, having fulfilled his vow, he became the center of the religious interest of the village, the town, the city, to which he belonged,—an object of holy awe. Thus pilgrimizing became a life-work, a calling. There were people who adopted it as a vocation, wandering all their life from one shrine to another. Places of pilgrimage sprang up everywhere—at the tombs of the saints and martyrs (St. Peter and St. Paul in Rome, St. Thecla in Seleucia, St. Stephen in Hippo in Africa, the Forty Martyrs in Cappadocia, St. Felix at Nola in Campania, St. Martin at Tours, St. Adelbert at Gnesen, St. Willibrord at Echternach, St. Thomas at Canterbury, St. Olaf at Drontheim, etc.), or at the shrine of some wonder-working relic or image. At the Reformation, this practise was ridiculed by Protestants, but was retained by the Roman Catholic Church. In very recent times two new places of pilgrimage have excited the Roman Catholic world—Lourdes (q.v.) in the south of France, near the Pyrenees; and Knock, near Dublin, Ireland. In both places the Virgin Mary, it is claimed, revealed herself.

Among the most celebrated shrines toward which the currents of pilgrimage have been chiefly directed are the holy places of Palestine, which since the fifteenth century have been under the guardianship of the Franciscan order. Sanctuaries of the Virgin in various parts of the world, e.g., Loreto (q.v.) and Genezano in Italy, Chartres, Fourvières (in Lyons) and especially Lourdes (q.v.) in France, Einsiedeln (q.v.) in Switzerland, Mariazell in Austria, Guadeloupe and Montserrat in Spain, Walsingham in England (of which Erasmus wrote an account; Eng. transl., *Pilgrimages to Saint Mary of Walsingham and Saint Thomas of Canterbury*, 2d ed., London, 1875), etc. Among the sanctuaries of the angels and saints may be mentioned the "Limina apostolorum" on the Vatican hill, Monte Gargano, in Italy, in honor of St. Michael (it was the devotion of Norman pilgrims to this shrine that led to the Norman conquest of Naples); Czenstochau in Russian Poland, Compostella in Spain, in honor of St. James the Apostle, Mont St. Michel on the northern coast of France, to say nothing of the reputed tombs of Lazarus and his two sisters in the south. In North America the most noted place of pilgrimage is the shrine of St. Anne on the St.

Lawrence, a few miles below Quebec, where a reputed relic of St. Anne, mother of the Virgin, is preserved, having been brought from one of the sanctuaries dedicated to St. Anne in France. In general, all the tombs of prominent saints, or localities intimately connected with their careers, have at one time or another been centers of pilgrimages on the part of the pious faithful, even though the claims of many of them to such honor could not stand the test of critical investigation.

JAMES F. DRISCOLL.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. Marx, *Das Wallfahren in der katholischen Kirche*, Treves, 1842; A. Müller, *Das heilige Deutschland, Geschichte und Beschreibung der Wallfahrtsorte*, Cologne, 1897; H. von Rudniki, *Die berühmtesten Wallfahrtsorte der Erde*, Paderborn, 1897; L. Depont, *Pélerinages*, Paris, 1902; *DCA*, ii. 1635–42 (a detailed discussion, where the older literature is given); Schaff, *Christian Church*, iii. 465–469; *KL*, xii. 1199–1204; *JE*, x. 35–38. An important series is that of the *Palestine Pilgrims' Text Society*, 13 vols. and Index, London, 1897 (to the different volumes of the series valuable introductions are prefixed). For the Roman Catholic position on the subject, cf. Council of Trent, sessio xxv.

PILIGRIM: Bishop of Passau; d. May 20, 991. He was a kinsman of Friedrich, archbishop of Salzburg; was brought up at the Benedictine monastery of Niederaltaich; became a canon of the diocese; and was bishop of Passau, 971–991. For supporting Otto II. against Duke Henry he was rewarded with the monastery of St. Mary, a part of the revenue of Passau, and a confirmation of his title. The emperor approved his control of the monastery of Krems in 975, of St. Florian and St. Pölten in 976, and later of Ötting and Mattsee. The bishopric had no real claim on any one of these, but Piligrim knew how to establish one on forged documents. His inordinate ambition included the elevation of Passau into an archbishopric. This effort was advanced by means of the reoccupation of Ostmark and the beginning of the mission to Hungary, and Piligrim forwarded the most embellished reports to Pope Benedict VI. in 973 or 974, to the effect that about 5,000 persons had been baptized; countless Christian captives of war had openly confessed; that the heathen offered no hindrances; and that he was convinced that the erection of several bishoprics in Hungary was necessary in order to conserve and extend what had been accomplished. He advanced the fable to Benedict that at one time Lorch, which he represented to be the original seat of the bishopric of Passau, was the metropolitan seat for seven bishoprics in Pannonia and Moesia; and had a number of sources forged representing the relations of earlier popes with the archbishopric of Lorch. He asked, therefore, for the pallium and the authorization to erect the bishoprics in Hungary. His dependence upon fraud may have been due to the slight importance attached by the emperor and the pope to this enterprise. Failing in this effort, he succeeded in 977 in having a statement included in a document of Otto II., which declared Lorch to have been an ancient seat of primacy. But evidently Archbishop Friedrich induced the pope to confirm his right over Bavaria and Pannonia, and Piligrim had to abandon his plans. But Piligrim's care for his district was great, and churches were organized and synods were held. He was a man distinctly ahead of his times in his freedom from superstition, and made a marked impression upon his age. (A. HAUCK.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: E. Dümmler, *Piligrim von Passau und das Erzbistum Lorch*, Leipsic, 1854; S. Riezler, *Geschichte Baierns*, i. 391 sqq., Gotha, 1878; K. Schrödl, *Passavia sacra*, i. 77 sqq., Passau, 1879; Hauck, *KD*, iii. 166 sqq.

PILLAR OF FIRE AND CLOUD: The traditional supernatural guide and guard of the Hebrews during the desert wanderings. Beginning at Etham (Ex. xiii. 20 sqq.) the Hebrews were accompanied by a pillar of cloud by day and fire by night which went before them to show the way. When the Egyptians pursued, the pillar (Ex. xiv. 19 sqq.) passed behind the people serving as an obstructing bank of cloud toward the enemy and as light toward themselves. According to the adduced passages and other statements of the Bible, it was the Lord himself that went before Israel; theology regards it as "his angel," i.e., the agent of his manifestation (Ex. xxiii. 20 sqq.). This cloud also covered the tabernacle after its erection (Num. ix. 15 sqq.), and filled it (Ex. xl. 34 sqq.) as the habitation of God. On important occasions it descended upon the tabernacle, stood before it (Num. xii. 5) while the people worshiped, and regularly when Moses was to receive revelations (Num. xxxiii. 8–11). The glory of the Lord concealed in the cloud appeared at supreme moments to all the people (Ex. xvi. 10; Num. xiv 10, xvi. 19, xvii. 7). The ascent of the cloud from the tabernacle meant the breaking of the camp; its resting upon a place the sign of pitching camp (Ex. xl. 36 sqq.; Num. ix. 17–23). There is no doubt that there were not two but one and the same pillar which appeared by night as fire, by day as cloud. It is also clearly stated that this cloud was the covering of God when he descended upon Sinai (Ex. xxiv. 15 sqq.).

As to its physical nature, this mysterious cloud, like wonders in general, attaches itself to natural conditions and phenomena. However, two efforts to materialize that theophany must be rejected. One derives the pillar of cloud from the caravan-fire which was borne before the march. Reference is made to Alexander's march (E. Curtius, *Griechische Geschichte*, V., ii. 7, Berlin, 1868–74; Eng. translation, *History of Greece*, London, 1868–73), which shows how great armies made use of fire for guidance, just as caravans do to-day. But this is contradicted by the materials of the narrative noted above, and the divinity of the cloud demands a supernatural phenomenon. Such a cloud lay pregnant with fire on Sinai where God most positively offered his majesty to the gaze of the people. For the same reason, the view of Ewald (followed by Riehm and Dillman) must also be rejected, who supposed that the altar-fire was the kernel of the tradition.

The cloud in the mean time became a subject for theological speculation. The author of the Wisdom of Solomon saw in it the divine wisdom (x. 17; cf. xviii. 3, xix. 7); Philo, the divine Logos (*Opera*, ed. T. Mangey, 501, London, 1742).

C. VON ORELLI.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The subject is best discussed in the commentaries on the passages (see under HEXATEUCH); also in the works on the O. T. cited under BIBLICAL THEOLOGY,

and in those on the history of Israel (see under AHAB; and ISRAEL, HISTORY OF). Consult further the articles in the Bible dictionaries, e.g., *EB*, iii. 3775–78; *JE*, x. 39.

PILOT, WILLIAM: Anglican; b. at Bristol, England, Dec. 30, 1841. He was educated at St. Boniface's College, Westminster, and St. Augustine's College, Canterbury, and was ordered deacon in 1867 and advanced to the priesthood in 1868. From 1867 to 1875 he was vice-principal of Queen's College, St. John's, Newfoundland, as well as incumbent of Quidi Vidi, Newfoundland, and in 1883–84 was principal of Queen's College. Since 1875 he has been superintendent of education in Newfoundland and in 1905 was also appointed commissary to the bishop of Newfoundland. He is a canon of the Anglican cathedral at St. John's. In theology he is an "Anglican of the old type," and has written essays on nomenclature and folk-lore of Newfoundland, also the geography of Newfoundland, and sketches of early church history of Newfoundland.

PINYTUS: Bishop of Cnossus, Crete, in the second century, according to Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.*, iv. 21, 23, Eng. transl., *NPNF*, 2 ser., i. 197–198, 200–202), and contemporary of Dionysius of Corinth (q.v.). Eusebius gives some extracts from the correspondence of the two. Dionysius, it appears, wrote to the bishop of Cnossus asking him not to impose too strict a yoke of chastity upon his brethren. But Pinytus was unmoved by this counsel and replied that Dionysius might impart stronger doctrine and feed his congregation with a more perfect epistle inasmuch as Christians could not always subsist on milk or tarry in childhood. It may be that Pinytus was influenced by Montanistic views; however, Eusebius vouches for his orthodoxy and his care for the welfare of those placed under him.

(A. HAUCK.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The references are collected in Harnack, *Litteratur*, i. 237. See the literature under DIONYSIUS OF CORINTH.

PIONIUS: Christian martyr of the middle of the third century. Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.*, IV., xv. 47; Eng. transl., *NPNF*, 2 series, i. 192) refers to his own lost "Collection of the Ancient Martyrdoms" as containing accounts of martyrdoms in the time of Polycarp. Among the martyrs referred to was a certain Pionius, of whom an account was given in Eusebius' source and used by him, which included a report of his confessions, his courageous defense of the Christian faith before people and authorities, his friendly reception of the fugitives from persecution, and his encouraging address to the brethren who visited him in prison, as well as his endurance of sufferings, nailings, and burning. In spite of some uncertainties in particulars, the genuineness of the account seems evident and presents a good picture of events during the Decian persecution (see DECIUS, CAIUS MESSIUS QUINTUS TRAJANUS). The "Acts" from which Eusebius draws points distinctly (ii. 1, ix. 4, 23) to the persecution of the year 250 under the consuls Decius and Gratus; the reference to the time of Marcus Aurelius by Eusebius is explained by the connection with the "Acts of Polycarp." Pionius was seized at the anniversary of the martyrdom of Polycarp, Feb. 23, which day also was a Sabbath in 250, and he was burned with a certain Metrodorus on Mar. 12. The Pionius of this article must be distinguished from Pionius, author of *Vita Polycarpi* (350–400).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sources are: T. Ruinart, *Acta Martyrum*, pp. 185–198, Regensburg, 1859; *ASB*, Feb., i. 37–46; F. Miklosich, *Monumenta linguæ palæoslovenicæ*, pp. 94 sqq., Vienna, 1851; O. von Gebhardt, in *Archiv für slavische Philologie*, xviii (1896), 156 sqq., in *Ausgewählte Märtyrakten*, pp. 59 sqq., Tübingen, 1901, and in *Acta martyrum selecta*, pp. 59 sqq., Berlin, 1902. Consult further: Krüger, *History*, pp. 385–386; B. Aubé, *L'Église et l'état dans la seconde moitié du 3. siècle*, pp. 140 sqq., Paris, 1885; J. B. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, i. 622–626, 695–702, London, 1889; T. Zahn, in *Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, iv. 271 A 4, Leipsic, 1891; J. A. F. Gregg, *The Decian Persecution*, pp. 242 sqq., ib. 1897; Bardenhewer, *Geschichte*, ii. 631–632; *DCB*, iv. 397, 428; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, ii. 113–114.

PIPER, KARL WILHELM FERDINAND: German church historian; b. at Stralsund (120 m. n.w. of Berlin) May 7, 1811; d. at Berlin Nov. 28, 1889. He studied theology at the universities of Berlin and Göttingen, 1829–33; was tutor in theology at the latter institution, 1833–40; privat-docent in church history at the University of Berlin, 1842; and associate professor after 1842. As church historian he belonged to the school of Neander. His earlier literary activity dealt with chronology and resulted in the publication of the "Evangelical Calendar" (1850–70), in which he substituted for the names of saints, those of Christian worthies, and furnished annually biographical sketches. His principal pursuit became the investigation of Christian monuments of art, as a source for church history. The first important product appeared as the first part of the projected work, *Mythologie und Symbolik der Christlichen Kunst* (2 vols., Weimar, 1847–51) setting forth the influence of pagan mythology upon Christianity. The intended second part was never prepared. His next great work was *Einleitung in die monumentale Theologie* (Gotha, 1867). Other works are: *Ueber den christlichen Bilderkreis* (Berlin, 1852); and *Die Kalendarien und Martyrologien der Angelsachsen* (1862). Piper does not treat art for art's sake; form and style are almost ignored. He always seeks to present the content for his specific purpose. He was the founder of the Christian museum at the University of Berlin and its director from 1849 till his death. (A. HAUCK.)

PIPPIN, DONATION OF. See PAPAL STATES.

PIRKE ABOTH, pîr-kê' ā'bot ("Sayings of the Fathers"): The ninth tractate of the fourth order ("Damages") of the Mishna. An especially valuable translation, with excellent notes, is found in C. Taylor's *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, 2d ed., Cambridge, 1899. See TALMUD.

PIRKHEIMER, pirk-hɑim'er, **CHARITAS:** Sister of Wilibald Pirkheimer (q.v.) and abbess of the nunnery of St. Clara at Nuremberg; b. at Eichstätt (42 m. w.s.w. of Regensburg) Mar. 21, 1466; d. at Nuremberg Aug. 19, 1532. At the age of twelve she entered the nunnery of which she became abbess in 1503. In the same year she induced her sister Clara, who succeeded her in the headship of the cloister in 1532, to enter as a sister and to undertake the work of secretary and assistant. She was especially faithful in the mainte-

nance of discipline and nurture of those committed to her care. By her brother she was led to the study of patristics, but was never reconciled to the Reformation, being a devoted daughter of her church. Her character was necessarily developed in a one-sided direction through her early entrance into the nunnery, and she was apparently quite morbid through continued contemplation of her sins and weaknesses. Her *Denkwürdigkeiten* pictures the misfortunes of her cloister (given in C. Höfler's *Frankischen Studien*, vol. iv., part 2, Vienna, 1853).

Bibliography: F. Binder, *Charitas Pirkheimer*, Freiburg, 1873.

PIRKHEIMER, WILIBALD: German humanist; b. at Eichstätt (42 m. w.s.w. of Regensburg) Dec. 5, 1470; d. at Nuremberg Dec. 22, 1530. He received his elementary education from his father and then studied at the universities of Pavia and Padua the classics, music, and jurisprudence for seven years. He was city councilor at Nuremberg, 1496–1523; was entrusted with diplomatic charges by his city; and served in the war with the Swiss as imperial counselor to Maximilian I. and Charles V., as a result of which he wrote *Historia belli Suitensis sive Helvetici* (in *Pirckheimeri opera politica*, pp. 63–92, Frankfort, 1610), which secured him the appellation of the German Xenophon. But Pirkheimer was famous for his versatile scholarship; he was identified with the revival in Germany of the humanities from Italy and shared the leadership with Erasmus and Reuchlin. He translated into Latin wholly or in part the works of Euclid, Xenophon, Plato, Ptolemy, Theophrastus, Plutarch, Lucian of Samosata, Gregory of Nazianzus, and John of Damascus, and possessed a large library gathered in the cities of Italy and freely thrown open to friends of learning.

Though in conflict with crystallized scholasticism, he was not inimical to the Church. However, he was a part of the movement which prepared the way for the coming division. At the beginning of the Reformation he took his position with Luther; called himself "a good Lutheran" in 1522; and for his *Eckius dedolatus* (ed. S. Szamatolski, 1891) and for a defensive polemic for Luther he drew upon himself a bull at the instigation of Johann Eck (q.v.) in 1521, but was absolved the same year. After 1524 he gradually fell away from Protestantism and turned more and more toward the Roman Catholic Church, mainly through his relation with the monastery of the Poor Clares (see Clare, Saint, and the Poor Clares) at Nuremberg the abbess of which (1503–32) was his famous sister Charitas (q.v.). When the innovators in that city, Hieronymus Ebner, Caspar Nützel, and Lazarus Spengler, went so far in 1524 as to induce a voluntary abandonment of the monastery by the nuns, Pirkheimer's tender relation with his sister impelled him to advance to the defense. He appealed to Melanchthon through whose influence the abolition was stayed. His last work was in defense of the monastery, the *Oratoria Apologetica* (1529; ed. G. J. Gretser, *Opera omnia*, xvii., Regensburg, 1734–41).

(F. Listt.)

Bibliography: An incomplete edition of the *Opera*, ed. M. Goldast, was issued Frankfort, 1610, with the basal life by K. Rittershausen. Pirkheimer's "Autobiography" is given by K. Rück in his *Wilibald Pirckheimer's Schweizerkrieg*, Munich, 1895. There are biographies by F. Roth, Halle, 1887; in *ADB*, xxxv. 118–122; and in E. Münch, *Wilibald Pirkheimers Schweizerkrieg und Ehrenhandel mit seinen Feinden zu Nürnberg*, Basel, 1826. Consult further: R. Hagen, *Wilibald Pirkheimer in seinem Verhältnis zum Humanismus und zur Reformation*, Nuremberg, 1882; O. Markwart, *Wilibald Pirkheimer als Geschichtschreiber*, Zurich, 1886; P. Drews, *Wilibald Pirkheimers Stellung zur Reformation*, Leipsic, 1887; P. Kalkoff, *Pirkheimers und Spenglers Lösung vom Banne 1521*, Breslau, 1896; H. Westermeyer, *Zur Bannangelegenheit Pirkheimers und Spenglers*, in *Beiträge zur bayerischen Kirchengeschichte*, ii. 1–8, Erlangen, 1896.

PIRMIN (PERMIN, PRIMIN), SAINT: Abbot and missionary in southern Germany; d. at the monastery of Hornbach (75 m. n.n.w. of Strasburg) Nov. 3, probably in 753. According to Rabanus Maurus (q.v.) he was a foreigner, and being a Benedictine, it is concluded that he was an Anglo-Saxon. He was first known as rural bishop of Meaux, where he preached in Latin and Frankish, during the reign of Theodoric IV. (720–737) and was called thence as missionary to the people about Lake Constance. There he first established the monastery of Reichenau on an island in the western arm of Lake Constance. When the Alemanni under Theobald rose against Charles Martel, Pirmin was compelled to leave his see, and repaired to Alsace, where, under Count Eberhard, he completed the monastery of Murbach in the Vosges. He is also said to have founded the religious houses of Altaich in Bavaria and Pfaefers in Switzerland, of Schuttern and Gengenbach in Offenburg, Schwartzach near Lichtenau in Baden, Maurmünster and Neuweiler in Alsace, and finally the abbey of Hornbach near Zweibrücken.

There still exists a document of Pirmin entitled *Dicta abbatis Pirminii, de singulis libris canonicis scarapsus;* first published by J. Mabillon in *Vetera analecta*, iv (Paris, 1723); ed. by A. Gallandi in *Bibliotheca veterum patrum*, xiii., pp. 277–285 (Venice, 1779); *MPL*, lxxxix. 1030 sqq. *Scarapsus* is evidently a corruption for *excerptus*. These sayings written in barbarous Latin are directed to baptized Christians, offering instruction in faith and morals and supported by abundant Scripture citation. Man was created to fill the vacancy made by fallen angels. Satan is vanquished by the humility of the Son of God and sin by the cross. The vocation of the Christian is to follow Christ and shun evil. Of elementary sins there are eight: lust, gluttony, fornication, wrath, despair, recklessness, vainglory, and pride. He warns against the fleshly sins: divorce, which should not be permitted excepting with the consent of both parties and for the love of Christ; fornication, covetousness, untruthfulness, and sorcery. Actual sins are to be atoned for by almsgiving. (A. Hauck.)

Bibliography: Early *Vitæ* and other documents, with comment, are in *ASB*, Nov., ii., 1, pp. 2–54, and, ed. Holder-Egger, in *MGH, Script.*, xv (1887–88), 21–35. Consult: M. Görringer, *Pirminius*, Zweibrücken, 1841; P. Heber, *Die vorkarolingischen christlichen Glaubenshelden am Rhein*, pp. 212–248, Frankfort, 1858; J. H. A. Ebrard, *Die iroschottische Missionskirche*, pp. 344 sqq., 453 sqq., Gütersloh, 1873; J. Weicherding, *Der St. Pirminsberg* und

der heilige Pirmin, Luxemburg, 1875; C. P. Caspari, *Kirchenhistorische Anecdota*, i. 149 sqq., Christiania, 1883; E. Egli, *Kirchengeschichte der Schweiz*, pp. 72–82, Zurich, 1893; Friedrich, *KD*, ii. 580 sqq., Rettberg, *KD*, ii. 50–84; Hauck, *KD*, i. 346; *DCB*, iv. 405.

PIRSTINGER, BERTHOLD. See PUERSTINGER.

PISA, COUNCILS OF: The council of Pisa in 1409, standing as a moment in the tendency to establish an episcopal oligarchy in place of a papal monarchy, was occasioned by the great schism in the western Church and the need of reforms. There had been since 1378 two popes in western Christendom and it was imperative to put an end to the confusion incident to a double system of bishops, priests, and sacraments. The two popes themselves, Gregory XII. of Rome and Benedict XIII. of Avignon, were opposed to arbitrating their claims. A majority of the cardinals of both parties resolved to ignore their obstinate chiefs and came together at Livorno in 1408 and invited the representatives of the Church to a general council at Pisa on Mar. 25, 1409. A large number of church dignitaries besides representatives of the sacred orders, universities, and secular kings and princes obeyed the summons of the cardinals. The claims of both papal pretenders were considered, and after ten days the cardinals entered into a conclave at the archiepiscopal palace at Pisa, and, on June 26, chose unanimously the Cardinal Peter Philargi, archbishop of Milan, as pope. He was a native Greek of the island of Crete, and reputed to be of a conciliatory disposition. He assumed the name of Alexander V The cardinals had not taken pains to find out whether the several Christian states would accept their election as valid. The consequence was that instead of a two-headed papacy they had created a three-headed one, a result foreseen by such men as Pierre d'Ailly (q.v.). Rupert of Germany, Ladislaus of Naples, and certain other minor princes stood by Gregory XII.; Spain and Portugal supported Benedict XIII. The cause of union was thus unsuccessful. The cause of reformation, on the other hand, fared no better, for it proved that the great assembly was unprepared to deal with so great a problem. The reformation of the Church, both head and members, was postponed to the next council, to which both Pope Alexander V. and Council agreed. The materials of reformation were to be first discussed at provincial, diocesan, or chapter synods; but later developments proved that no one had in mind a reform of the hierarchical structure. The only consequence was the testimony to the world that there was a Church universal strong enough to withstand the strain of even a thirty-years schism. (P. TSCHACKERT.)

The second Council of Pisa was called by nine cardinals under the Spanish Cardinal Carvajal, three of whom, however, had not formally given assent, to convene Sept. 1, 1511. The council was a political step aimed at Pope Julius II., who was involved in conflict with Ferrara and France. It was of an abortive nature, attended by only a small contingent, and soon adjourned to Milan on account of popular opposition, where it declared Julius II. suspended, Apr. 21, 1512. Soon after, it dispersed to France from fear of the Swiss invasion, and died of inanition at Lyons toward the end of the year. Pope Julius II. retaliated by depriving the four leading schismatic cardinals of their dignities and calling a Lateran Council which met May 3, 1512, and excommunicated the members of the second Pisan Council. The whole matter was a futile attempt to galvanize into activity the conciliar movement of the previous century (ut sup.) and to employ it for political purposes.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The sources most accessible are Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, vi. 992 sqq.; Mansi, *Concilia*, xxvi. 1136 sqq., 1184 sqq., xvii. 1–10, 115 sqq., 358 sqq.; E. Martène and U. Durand, *Thesaurus novus anecdotorum*, ii. 1436 sqq., Paris, 1717; P. Tschackert, *Peter von Ailly*, appendix, 31–41, Gotha, 1877; and *Reichstagsakten*, vol. vi., ed. J. Weizsäcker, Gotha, 1888. Consult J. Lenfant, *Hist. du concile de Pise et de ce qui est passé de plus mémorable depuis ce concile jusqu'au concile de Constance*, 2 vols., Amsterdam, 1724; Pastor, *Popes*, i. 175–207; *Creighton*, Papacy, i. 223 sqq., iv. 269, v. 160–161; J. B. Schwab, *Johann Gerson*, Würzburg, 1858; C. Höfler, *Ruprecht von der Pfalz*, Freiburg, 1861; Lehman, *Die Pisaner Concil von 1511*, Breslau, 1874; G. Erler, *Dietrich von Nieheim*, Leipsic, 1887; F. Stuhr, *Die Organisation und Geschäftsordnung des Pisaner . Konzils*, Schwerin, 1891; H. Rossbach, *Das Leben und die . Wirksamkeit des Bernaldino Lopez de Carvajal*, vol. i., Breslau, 1892; J. Haller, *Papsttum und Kirchenreform*, vol. i., Berlin, 1903; *KL*, x. 23 sqq.; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, vii. 312–320; and the literature under GREGORY XII.; BENEDICT XIII. (1).

PISCATOR, pis-kê'tōr **(FISCHER), JOHANNES:** German theologian; b. at Strasburg Mar. 27, 1546; d. at Herborn (32 m. n.e. of Nassau) July 26, 1625. He was educated at Tübingen; became professor of theology at Strasburg in 1573; and of philosophy at Heidelberg in 1574 as a follower of Peter Ramus; was made scholastic rector at Siegen in 1577; professor of theology at Neustadt-on-the-Haardt in 1578; rector at Moers in 1581; and was instructor at the high school at Herborn, in 1584–1625. Tireless in industry, Piscator prepared Latin commentaries collectively of the New Testament (Herborn, 1595–1609) and the Old Testament (1612, 1618), and a German translation of the Bible (1605–19). He followed with *Anhang des herbonischen biblischen Wercks* (1610), noted for its wealth of archeological, historical, and theological material. He left a multitude of text-books in philosophy, philology, and theology, of which *Aphorismi doctrinæ Christianæ* (1596) was much used. His significance for theology was his opposition to the doctrine of the active obedience of Christ. "Whoever denies that Christ was subject to the law, denies that he was man." If the imputation of the active obedience were sufficient man would be free from obedience as well as from the curse. [From being an advocate of supralapsarianism in the most extreme form, as in his controversy with Conrad Vorstius (cf. extracts in A. H. Newman, *Manual of Church History*, ii. 338–339, 3 vols., Philadelphia, 1900–03), Piscator became a pronounced Arminian. A. H. N.]

(E. F. KARL MÜLLER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Steubing, in *ZHT*, 1841, part 4, pp. 98 sqq.; F. C. Baur, *Die christliche Lehre von der Versöhnung*, pp. 352 sqq., Tübingen, 1838; W. Gass, *Geschichte der protestantischen Dogmatik*, i. 422 sqq., 4 vols., Berlin, 1854–67; A. Ritschl, *Die christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung*, i. 271 sqq., Bonn, 1889, Eng. transl., *Critical Hist. of the Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation*, Edinburgh, 1872.

PISGAH. See MOAB.

PISIDIA. See Asia Minor, VII.

PISTIS SOPHIA. See Ophites.

PISTOJA, SYNOD OF. See Ricci, Scipione de', Johannes.

PISTORIUS, JOHANNES BECKER: The name of two persons, father and son, who were influential, though widely divergent, figures in the religious controversies of the sixteenth century.

1. Johannes Pistorius the Elder: First Protestant pastor at Nidda, Hesse; b. in the latter part of the fifteenth century; d. 1583. In company with Butzer, he appears to have attended the Diet of Augsburg in 1530, and in 1541 he became superintendent of the diocese of Alsfeld. Landgrave Philip accorded him the utmost confidence. In 1540 he was one of the Hessian delegates to the convention at Hagenau, and soon afterward he was delegated to attend the colloquy at Worms, in 1540–41. He accompanied the landgrave to the Diet of Regensburg, where the emperor appointed him to speak on the Protestant side, along with Melanchthon and Butzer. He stood loyal to Melanchthon, who esteemed him highly. In 1543, at the request of Butzer, the landgrave sent him to Cologne, to support attempts of the elector to introduce the Reformation there. He preached to large throngs, and to Melanchthon's complete satisfaction. In 1545–46, again as a colleague of Butzer, he took part in the religious conference at Regensburg. When it was purposed to introduce the Interim (q.v.) in Hesse, he headed a brave, though moderate, resistance, even being ready to resign his office. After the reaction brought about by the Elector Maurice, the landgrave, in 1557, despatched Pistorius to the princely diet at Frankfort; and not long afterward he was one of the speakers at the great religious conference in Worms (q.v.).

Controversies with Roman Catholics.

From this time on, Pistorius was busied more by the controversies raging among the Protestants than by the struggle against the Roman Catholic Church. He then deeply influenced the Hessian position, and his constant aim was either to preserve or to restore peace. Together with his colleagues at the Synod of Ziegenhain, in 1558, he gladly accepted the Frankfort Recess (q.v.). Owing to illness, he was unable to accompany the landgrave to the princes' conference at Naumburg in 1561, although he declared, in a formal expression of opinion, that the revised Augsburg Confession contained no doctrinal deviation from the original. It was most probably Pistorius who composed the important Hessian opinion, dated Oct. 19, 1566, regarding the "final answer" of the Württemberg theologians to the Heidelberg divines (Tübingen, 1566). This document takes a very decided stand against the Heidelberg party with their Calvinistic teaching regarding the Lord's Supper, and it recognizes the doctrine of Ubiquity (q.v.). At the momentous eighth general synod of 1576, when the Torgau Book (see Formula of Concord) was under advisement, Pistorius approved its basal creed, its various doctrinal statements and antitheses, its teaching concerning the Lord's Supper, and, pending deeper investigation, its Christology. At the same time, he shared the scruples urged by the majority against emphasizing the *Invariata*, the "damnation" of the Calvinists, and the subtlety of the doctrine of ubiquity; and he was, therefore, the first to sign the treatise explanatory of these points. At the general assembly in Treysa (Nov., 1577), Pistorius and the majority voted to reject the Book of Bergen (see Formula of Concord). It is thus evident that Pistorius undervalued the significance and range of the dogmatic questions of the period. He intensely disliked doctrinal polemics, and always treated dogmatic questions from a practical point of view. Administratively he evinced a very influential activity in organization and polity, as well as in public worship, discipline and education, during his entire term of office. At his death he left an unfinished work on the diets and colloquies that he had attended from 1540 to 1557.

Activity in Inter-Protestant Controversy.

2. Johannes Pistorius the Younger: Roman Catholic convert and apologist; b. at Nidda (19 m. s.e. of Giessen), Hesse, Feb. 4, 1546; d. at Freiburg Sept., 1608. He studied first theology and then medicine, and in 1568 published at Frankfort the peculiar cabalistic treatise: *De vera curandæ pestis ratione*, which he followed by his *Artis cabalisticæ scriptores* (Basel, 1587). During the life-time of Charles II. (d. 1577), sole regent of the margravate of Baden-Durlach, Pistorius became court physician, though he was continually taking part in theological affairs. Meanwhile he had gone over from Lutheranism to Calvinism; and shortly afterward, in 1588, became a convert to the Roman Catholic Church. He now wrote a number of open letters which opened a controversy on the nature of the Church, an issue that he henceforth deemed the most important point under discussion. At the same time he made earnest, though unsuccessful, efforts to convert Margrave Ernest Frederick. With the Margrave Jacob, at Hochberg Castle, he had better fortune. This chivalrous, learned, and traveled prince had frequently received foreign Protestants, although in 1585–86, when in the Spanish military service, he had fought against the adherents of the new teachings in the archdiocese of Cologne. He was very accessible, moreover, to Roman Catholic court influences, and now became a convert to the ancient Church. To justify this step he arranged a religious conference at Baden, the residence of his cousin, Margrave Eduard Fortunatus, who had himself become a Roman Catholic in 1584. Margrave Jacob appeared with his councilor, Pistorius, his chaplain, Johann Zehender, the Jesuit Theodor Busœus, and others. Duke Christopher of Württemberg, who had been invited, did not attend in person, but sent certain councilors and theologians, Jakob Andreä, Jakob Heerbrand, and Gerlach. The debate (Nov. 18–19) occupied four sessions, though it did not turn on ubiquity, as the margrave had purposed, but on the visible and invisible Church, as Pistorius had arranged. The conference proved fruitless, however, and was soon broken off. Andreä and Pistorius parted in enmity,

Early Life and Conversion of Margrave Jacob.

and their oral dispute was prolonged in writing. Margrave Jacob, dissatisfied with the Baden conference, and continually influenced by the duke of Bavaria, ordered a second religious colloquy, this time at his Emmendingen residence. The Roman Catholic debaters were the chaplain Zehender and the rector Georg Hänlin of Freiburg. The margrave had wished for the debate to turn on the doctrine of justification; and at his command Pistorius had prepared 300 theses on that subject, but again succeeded in making the theory of the Church the topic of argument. After seven sessions (June 3–7, 1590), the margrave finally authorized the pronouncement that "Luther's church was a new church, and therefore a false church." Without further delay, the margrave solemnly became a member of the Roman Catholic Church in the monastery of Thennenbach (July 15), Buscœus granting him absolution. Great joy reigned in Rome, and Pope Sixtus V. appointed a feast of thanksgiving. Before it could be held, however, Margrave Jacob, after a brief illness, had died (Aug. 7, 1590). Immediately after his death, Ernest Frederick appeared at Emmendingen and forbade any change in religious conditions, but when this prince was later about to force Calvinism upon his domain, he, too, died a sudden death (1604). The entire margravate now devolved on George Frederick, whom neither Pistorius nor Ernest Frederick had been able to win from Lutheranism.

Pistorius outlived these events, but not in Baden. He took orders, became vicar general to the bishop of Constance, and resided for the most part in Freiburg, devoting himself zealously to writing polemics. Soon after his removal from Baden, he published *Wahrhafte Beschreibung, was sich bei Markgraf Jakobs letzter Krankheit und Ableben verlauffen* (1590) and *Orationes de vita et morte Jacobi* (1591).

Clerical Career and Writings.

Of great note among his many and widely published controversial writings was his *Anatomia Lutheri* (2 parts, Cologne, 1595–98), in which he sought to prove from Luther's writings that the Reformer was possessed of the seven evil spirits (lust, blasphemy, etc.), and that he was an utter abomination. The constructive counterpart to this work was his *Wegweiser für all verführten Christen, das ist, ein wahrhaftiger Bericht von vierzehn durch die unrechtgläubigen in Streit gezogenen Artikeln, daraus jedermann der römischen Kirche Wahrheit erkennen kann* (Münster, 1599). Pistorius rendered lasting service through his works on history and genealogy, particularly by his edition of the *Scriptores rerum Germanicarum* (3 vols., Frankfort, 1583–1607) and by his *Polonicæ historiæ corpus* (3 vols., Basel, 1582). His zeal was recognized by his church, for he was appointed imperial and Bavarian councilor, apostolic prothonotary, provost of the cathedral at Breslau, and domestic prelate to the abbot of Fulda.

CARL MIRBT.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: For 1, besides the literature under CONTARINI, GASPARO, and PHILIP OF HESSE, much of which is pertinent, consult: H. Heppe, *Kirchengeschichte der beiden Hessen*, vol. i., Marburg, 1876; idem, *Geschichte der hessischen Generalsynoden 1568–82*, 2 vols., Cassel, 1847; *Philipps des Grossmüthigen hessische Kirchenreformations-Ordnung*, ed. K. A. Credner, pp. ccxxxvi. sqq., Giessen, 1852; F. W. Hassencamp, *Hessische Kirchengeschichte*, 2 vols., Frankfort, 1864; P. Vetter, *Die Religionsverhandlungen auf dem Reichstag zu Regensburg*, pp. 71 sqq., Jena, 1889; F. Herrmann, *Das Interim in Hessen*, Marburg, 1901.

For 2: K. F. Vierordt, *Geschichte der evangelischen Kirche in dem Grossherzogtum Baden*, ii. 21 sqq., Carlsruhe, 1856; A. Räss, *Die Konvertiten seit der Reformation*, ii. 488 sqq., iii. 83 sqq., Freiburg, 1886; J. Janssen, *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes*, v. 389 sqq., 395 sqq., Freiburg, 1886, Eng. transl., ix. 144–145, x. passim, St. Louis, 1906; F. von Weech, *Badische Geschichte*, pp. 276 sqq., Carlsruhe, 1890.

PITHOM: A treasure city built for Rameses II. by the Israelites (Ex. i. 11). It has been identified by Brugsch with Succoth, the first encampment on the route of the exodus, the starting-point being Rameses (Ex. xii. 37, xiii. 20), and by Naville with the present Tell al-Maskhuta in the Wady al-Tumilât on the line of the Sweet-Water Canal, between Ismaïlia and Tell al-Kebir. See EGYPT, I., 4, § 2, 6, § 4.

PITRA, pî"trā, JEAN BAPTISTE: Cardinal; b. at Champforgeuil, near Autun (230 m. s.e. of Paris) Aug. 12, 1812; d. at Rome Feb. 9, 1889. He studied at the seminary at Autun, became priest in 1836, entered the order of St. Benedict in 1840, and lived in the abbey of Solesmes. In 1843 he was sent as prior to a new monastery at Paris, whence he made journeys throughout France, Switzerland, Holland, Belgium, and England, in the interest of his order. He devoted himself to historical research and at Paris he helped to project the *Patrologia* of the Abbé Migne, and assisted in the publication of the first four volumes. In 1858 Pope Pius IX. sent him to Russia in the hope of effecting a union with the Greek Church, and he took occasion to prosecute his researches in archives, monasteries, and libraries. In 1861 he entered the service of the Propaganda; two years later he was made a cardinal priest; in 1869 he became librarian of the Vatican; in 1879, cardinal bishop of Frascati; and in 1884 he retired to the bishopric of Porto. He was an earnest advocate of the papal supremacy. He was the author of *Études sur la collection des actes des saints par les Bollandists* (Paris, 1850); and *Histoire de Saint Léger* (1846). His greatest work is *Spicilegium Solesmense* (4 vols., 1852–58), followed by *Analecta sacra spicilegio Solesmensi parata* (8 vols., 1876–91), and *Analecta novissima* (2 vols., 1885–88); the whole monumental work is of immense value as it is a treasure-house of hitherto unprinted documents relating to ecclesiastical history. To be added are the *Juris ecclesiastici Græcorum historia et monumenta* (Rome, 1864–68), and *Triodion katanacticon* (1879); both the fruit of four years of travel and special study after 1858, when the pope directed him to devote his attention to the ancient and modern canons of the eastern churches; and *Hymnographie de l'église grecque* (1867).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Biographies are by A. Battandier, Paris, 1893; and F. Cabrol, ib. 1893.

PITZER, ALEXANDER WHITE: Presbyterian; b. at Salem, Roanoke County, Va., Sept. 14, 1834; studied at Virginia Collegiate Institute (now Roanoke College, 1848–51); graduated at Hampden-Sidney College, Va. (1854); studied at Union Theo-

logical Seminary, Va. (1854–55), and at Danville Theological Seminary, Ky. (1855–57); was pastor at Leavenworth, Kan. (1857–61); Sparta, Ga. (1862–65); Liberty, Va. (1866–67); organized Central Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., in 1868, and has since been its pastor. He was also professor of Biblical history and literature in Howard University in the same city (1876–90). He is the author of *Ecce Deus Homo*, published anonymously (Philadelphia, 1867); *Christ, Teacher of Men* (1877); *The New Life not the Higher Life* (1878); *Confidence in Christ* (1889); *Manifold Ministry of the Holy Spirit* (1894); and *Predestination* (1899).

PIUS, pai'us: The name of ten popes.

Pius I.: Bishop of Rome 140–155. According to the Muratorian Canon (q.v.) he was a brother of the Hermas who was the author of "The Shepherd." Tertullian ("Against Marcion," i. 19) declares that Marcion in the time of this pope went to Rome for the purpose of establishing his sect there. According to Irenæus, Valentinus and the Syrian Cerdon were active there at the same time. Thus the pontificate of Pius I. was a stormy one. What part Pius took in these conflicts and controversies is not known, but one of the ablest of his champions and allies was Justin Martyr (q.v.). Pius I. was canonized and his festival is July 11.

(H. Böhmer.)

Bibliography: Sources are Irenæus, *Hær.*, III., iii. 3, Eng. transl., *ANF*, i. 416; Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, IV., xi., Eng. transl., *NPNF*, 2 ser., i. 182 sqq.; *Liber pontificalis*, ed. Duchesne, i. 4–5, Paris, 1886, ed. Mommsen, in *MGH, Gest. pont. Rom.*, i (1898), 14. Consult, Jaffé, *Regesta*, i. 7–8; Harnack, *Litteratur*, i. 789, ii. 1, pp. 70 sqq. (where literature on the lists of Roman bishops is fully given); J. Langen, *Geschichte der römischen Kirche*, i., iii. sqq., Bonn, 1881; Bower, *Popes*, i. 12–13; Platina, *Popes*, i. 27–29.

Pius II. (Æneas Silvius, Enea Silvio de' Piccolomini): Pope 1458–64. He was born in Corsignano, the present Pienza (100 m. n.n.w. of Rome), Oct. 18, 1405. He studied at the University of Siena, came under the spell of the penitential

Early Life. appeal of Bernardino of Siena (1425), and was with difficulty restrained from joining the Franciscan order. At Florence he began the study of law, in deference to his father's wishes, but against his own inclination; he was fortunate, however, in finding a position as secretary in the employment of the bishop of Fermo. The latter took him to the Council of Basel (q.v.), already under the shadow of suspension at the hand of Eugenius IV (1431). Like his master, whom Piccolomini before long exchanged for one offering higher pay, he joined the opposition; though leaving Basel and making a journey in the political service of Cardinal Albergati, first to the Netherlands, then to Scotland, and not returning to Basel until 1436. Though still a layman, Piccolomini soon managed to gain a certain esteem in connection with the council. His cleverness and rhetorical talent procured him the post of abbreviator, and caused him to be commissioned on various embassies. But when it was proposed to nominate him as conclavist in behalf of electing a successor to Eugenius IV., whom the council had pronounced to be deposed, he declined this honor, as he wished to avoid consecration in order that he might still indulge in pleasures not permitted to the clergy. In the year 1438 or 1439, Piccolomini began his *Commentarii* on the Council of Basel; in 1440, he wrote the *Libellus dialogorum de auctoritate consilii generalis.* Wide prospects were disclosed to him when, in 1442, he attended the imperial diet at Frankfort as envoy. It was there that the bishops of Chiemsee and Treves recommended him to King Frederick III., who crowned him with the laurel, poet of scandalous verses though he was; and then took him into his own service as secretary. An index to his mood and frame of mind at that time is found in a letter addressed to his father from Vienna, Sept. 22, 1443. He asks him to receive in his home one of his own (Piccolomini's) illegitimate sons; and adds by way of excuse, that he, "of course, was no capon, nor did he belong to your cold natures," casting at his father the shameless comparison: "You know what sort of a chanticleer you were yourself." If, therefore, a "conversion" of Piccolomini is supposed to have occurred in the following year still this hindered him not from publishing so lascivious a tale as "Euryalus and Lucretia"; and the play *Chrysis*, of which one critic observes that it "shows brilliant wit and intimate familiarity with the indecencies and obscenities of the Roman poets, and is worthy to be produced in a brothel." And if he writes under date of Mar. 6, 1446: "I am a subdeacon; something I once thoroughly abhorred to be. Levity has left me," the latter acknowledgment need not be taken for very serious repentance. The mainspring rather appears in what he writes two days later: "I own to you, dearest brother, I am satiated, surfeited; I have grown disgusted with Venus Venus even shuns me more than I abominate her." This is not the note of a penitential mood.

Simultaneously with his "conversion," as secretary of Frederick III. he changed the direction of his ecclesiastical statecraft. While Felix V. and the Council of Basel still regarded him as the advocate of their interests, he posed even in Vienna as one of the "neutrals," and as such openly

Diplomacy. appeared at the Nuremberg diet of 1444. The resolution passed by this diet, that the status of "neutrality" should last till 1445, but that Pope Eugenius IV. should then be requested to convoke a new council, was conveyed to Rome by Piccolomini in person; and if, indeed, he did not there contrive to gain approval for his errand, he still gained the entire favor and pardon of Eugenius IV. as far as his own course was concerned. Thus the political variation was effectually reversed; while in order to set aside the animosity still prevalent in Germany he supported the king with all his diplomatic art. Nor was reward from Rome lacking. After Eugenius IV had appointed him papal secretary, there followed, upon his returning to Vienna subsequently to the papal election of 1447, his nomination as bishop of Trieste, and, in 1450, as bishop of Siena. At this time Piccolomini conceived a new "mission" for himself, designed to carry him still higher and to obliterate all disagreeable souvenirs of his Basel period. He

endeavored to unite all Europe against the Turks, who already held in their control the citadel of classical Greek culture. So upon his urgent appeal, Nicholas V., on Sept. 30, 1453, issued the crusading bull, and Piccolomini, at the diets of Regensburg and Frankfort in 1454, delivered lofty orations against the hereditary foe of Christendom. The circumstance that, following the new papal election of 1455, Piccolomini transcended his commissioned authority, and in the name of the emperor acknowledged the obediency of Calixtus III., although the promises of the deceased pope had not so much as been rehearsed, let alone approved, finally brought him the greatly desired red hat, in Dec., 1456, though his thanks for its bestowal were cold. Thenceforth he remained at Rome in close alliance with Cardinal Rodrigo Borgia, later Alexander VI. He it was, at the conclave after the death of Calixtus III., in 1458, who carried through the election of Piccolomini.

Rome joyfully acclaimed the election of the worldly-fashioned humanist. Nevertheless, his election proved a disappointment to the mendicant *literati*, who beset him with all sorts of petitions. To his teacher alone, the aged Filelfo in Florence, was he accessible, and to him he granted a pension, though this was irregularly paid, and thus eventually gave occasion to invectives against the donor. However, Pius II. expended considerable sums in the acquisition of manuscripts and for the copying of valuable codices, besides employing artists of every kind, particularly architects, at Rome, Siena, and Corsignano. The first project which the new pope desired to carry out, was that of a crusade to recover Constantinople. An assembly of Christian princes, convened at Mantua, was opened by Pius II. himself; but the proposition to impose a general tithe for the purpose was withstood on the part of Venice and France, and also met with obstruction in the case of the Austrian Duke Sigismund's delegate, Gregory of Heimburg (q.v.). It was in course of the strife with him (for he appealed from the pope to a general council) that the notorius bull *Execrabilis* appeared, Jan. 18, 1460, which even thus early applied the ban against an appeal of that kind. This reveals the extreme of contrasts expressed in the man who formerly at Basel had championed the superiority of the councils over the popes. The action that emanated from Mantua, and even evoked a bull declaring war and issuing summons for a crusade (Jan. 14, 1460), had no practical result, because meanwhile, at Naples, the conflict which broke out between the Spanish and the French pretenders for the sovereignty rendered all procedure against the Turks impossible. The pope then turned his attention to other objects. He endowed with affluence his nephews and other favorites at Siena; he sought to annul the pragmatic sanction of Bourges (1438); in Germany, the opposition of the archbishop of Mainz, Dieter of Isenburg, necessitated measures of the utmost stringency, including that prelate's deposition (1461) followed next by the ban, which was not revoked until 1464. It was in Bohemia, however, that the strife became hottest. In 1458, King Podiebrad had been forced to promise, in conjunction with his oath of obedience to Calixtus III., that he would "lead back the Bohemian people from all errors and heresies to the true Catholic faith and into obedience toward the Roman Church," which promise Podiebrad was unable to meet because the Utraquists (see Huss, John), under Rokyczana, were too strong. On the contrary, at the national diet of May 15, 1461, he was compelled to guarantee them the perpetuation of the articles compacted at Prague. Accordingly, Pius II. stepped in with absolute power, and annulled the concession by the Council of Basel in favor of the Bohemians, although he himself had advised its adoption. Podiebrad, who personally was a Utraquist, now sided openly with that party. His subsequent citation to Rome, under date of June 15, 1464, on charge of heresy was rendered inoperative by the pope's death.

His Work as Pope.

A matter of less moment was involved in a conflict with Duke Sigismund of Tyrol, mentioned above as Duke Sigismund of Austria. For years the latter had stood at odds with the bishop of Brixen, the famous cardinal of Cues (Cusanus), who claimed the suzerainty over Tyrol. Cusanus had been commissioned during the convention at Mantua as governor of Rome, for he was an old friend of Pius II. But when he returned to Tyrol, Sigismund waylaid him and took him prisoner. Ban and interdict were the sequel (1460). On promising to procure at Rome the repeal of the church penalties, Cusanus recovered his freedom; but as nevertheless he failed to effect the desired repeal, he did not return to Tyrol. Neither did he survive the conclusion of subsequent negotiations between Pius II. and the duke (1461). With all these conflicts and cares, the pope was not permitted to compass his favorite plan. Even his marvelous attempt miscarried whereby the Sultan Muhamed II. was to be converted by epistolary persuasion. Above all, there was dearth of money. Within the papal domain, and but eight miles from Rome, the rich and sumptuous camp of the Alouni was discovered; whereupon Pius II. once again convened envoys of various powers, and in 1463 promulgated a new bull in behalf of a crusade. But except at Venice, which had a twofold interest in the enterprise, and Hungary, which was immediately menaced, the war against the Turks found no response. Then the pope headed affairs in person. In June, 1464, he journeyed to Ancona; and had the satisfaction, on August 12, when already gravely ill, of outliving the arrival of the Venetian fleet. But three days later he died, in his last words earnestly commending to those about him the crusade and the dependent members of his family. He seemed to have realized what had been his strongest motive in connection with this undertaking, to expiate, by means of a "good death," an evil life. "We think," for so had he said in the discourse wherewith he proclaimed the beginning of the crusade, "it might go well with us if God should please to have us end our days in his service."

Conflicts and Failures.

The tremendous chasm which seams his life Pius II. himself attempted to cover under a still greater equivocation. All that he formerly assailed at

Basel, and what he wrote to the praise of the council, he retracted by appeal to Augustine in the bull *In minoribus* of Apr. 26, 1463.

Character. Even previously, in the *Epistola retractationis* (cf. F. H. Reusch, *Der Index der verbotenen Bücher*, i. 40, Bonn, 1883), he had expressed himself in similar terms. And as touching his *Commentarii* on the Council of Basel, which during the sixteenth century found their way to the Index, he offset the same, in the years 1448–51, with a work advocating the papal point of view. Again, with reference to his obscene writings, about the period of 1440, the pope exclaims to his readers: "Away with that Æneas, and now receive Pius!" He brought his autobiography down to 1464; and it was issued in elaborated form by his friend Campano. Sundry historical, geographical, and ethnographical writings belong to the second period of his development, among them the history of Frederick III., wherein events of the years 1439–1456 are set forth in piquant style, also, the "Bohemian History," and the works "Europa" and "Asia." The vindictiveness of the aggrieved humanist Filelfo attributed to Pius crimes against nature such as not even Piccolomini had committed. His life in the papal office appears to have been unobjectionable; although the charge of nepotism was well founded. Withal he was eager to eradicate heresy, even though he laid himself open to a charge of heresy: "With reason was marriage taken away from priests; but with weightier reason it ought to be again allowed them." In the case of Bishop Pecock of Chichester (q.v.), this prelate had first denied the infallibility of the Church in comparison with Holy Scripture, but had afterward renounced that "false doctrine." However, when still again he opposed the Church's infallibility, the pope (1459) commanded his legate to see to it that the apostate be burned, together with his writings. And under date of May 11, 1463, he urged the bloodthirsty and avaricious inquisitors to allow no human consideration to prevail as against the Waldenses. Thus even with him, no sooner was the interest of the ecclesiastical authority at stake than everything else that stamps his nature—classical culture, creature benevolence, liberality of a richly endowed intellect—was thrust aside.

Upon the death of Pius II. at Ancona on August 15, his body was conveyed to Rome, and first bestowed in the (older) Church of St. Peter; subsequently (1614), sarcophagus and monument were lodged in the Church of S. Andrea della Valle.

Writings. The pope's writings were printed in a collective edition at Basel, 1551 and 1571. His *Literæ* appeared in many separate editions (Cologne, 1478; Nuremberg, 1481, 1486, 1496.) They were classified, with many accessions, by G. Voigt in *Archiv für Kunde österreichischer Geschichtsquellen* (1856); some supplements appear in Pastor's *Römische Päpste*, vol. ii., appendix (Freiburg, 1894; Eng. transl., vol. iii.); a new ed. was begun by R. Wolkan in the *Fontes rerum Austriacarum*, of which two volumes have appeared, Vienna, 1909–10. There is a Frankfort edition (1614) of his *Commentarii rerum memorabilium*, also, ed. G. Lesca, Pisa, 1894. The *Commentariorum de concilio Basiliensi* appeared at Cologne, 1521; his *Epistola Retractationis* is in C. Fea, *Pius II. a calumniis vindicatus* (Rome, 1823); the *Historia Friderici III.* is in A. F. Kollar, *Analecta Vindobonensia*, vol. ii. (Vienna, 1762); his "Addresses" were issued by Mansi (3 vols., Lucca, 1755–59); supplements by G. Cugnoni, *Opera inedita Pii II.* (Rome, 1883).

K. Benrath.

Bibliography: Creighton, *Papacy*, iii. 202–358; K. R. Hagenbach, *Erinnerungen an Æneas Silvius Piccolomini*, Basel, 1840; C. H. Verdière, *Essai sur Æneа Silvio Piccolomini*, Paris, 1843; J. M. Düx, *Der deutsche Kardinal Nicolaus von Cusa*, i. 169 sqq., ii. 119 sqq., 142 sqq., Regensburg, 1847; G. Voigt, *Eneas Silvius . . und sein Zeitalter*, 3 vols., Berlin, 1856–63; idem, *Die Wiederbelebung des klassischen Alterthums*, 2 vols., Berlin, 1880–81; H. G. P. Gengler, *Ueber Æneas Sylvius in seiner Bedeutung für die deutsche Rechtsgeschichte*, Erlangen, 1860; F. Palacky, *Geschichte von Böhmen*, iv. 2, pp. 80 sqq., Prague, 1860; A. Jäger, *Der Streit des Nikolaus von Cusa mit dem Herzog Sigmund von Oesterreich*, i. 317 sqq., ii. 44 sqq., Innsbruck, 1861; C. A. H. Markgraf, *Ueber das Verhältniss des Königs Georg von Böhmen zu Papst Pius II.*, Breslau, 1867; A. von Reumont, *Geschichte der Stadt Rom*, iii. 1, pp. 129 sqq., 387 sqq., Berlin, 1868; F. H. Reusch, *Index der verbotenen Bücher*, i. 36, 40, Bonn, 1883; A. Frind, *Die Kirchengeschichte Böhmens*, iv. 46 sqq., Prague, 1878; G. W. Kitchin, *Life of Pius II.*, London, 1881; A. Beeg, *Pius II. in seiner Bedeutung als Geograph*, Halle, 1901; W. Boulting, *Æneas Silvius (Enea Silvio de Piccolomini—Pius II.), Orator, Man of Letters, Statesman and Pope*, London, 1909; Schaff, *Christian Church*, v. 2, passim; Mirbt, *Quellen*, pp. 169–170; Ranke, *Popes*, i. 28–29, 306; Pastor, *Popes*, vols. ii.–iii. passim; Bower, *Popes*, iii. 241–244; Platina, *Popes*, ii. 257–275, Milman, *Latin Christianity*, vii. 565, viii. 64–122.

Pius III. (Francesco Todeschini): Pope 1503. He was a nephew of Pope Pius II. and was born at Siena in 1439. His uncle had him educated at Perugia, and influenced him to adopt the name and arms of the Piccolomini. He also created him archbishop of Siena in 1460, cardinal in 1462, and governor of Rome in 1464. By the following popes the "cardinal of Siena" was largely employed on diplomatic missions. That he possessed courage was evinced by his vigorous opposition, in 1497, restraining Alexander VI. from erecting a duchy out of portions of the States of the Church in behalf of his son, the duke of Gandia. He is supposed to have owed his election in Sept., 1503, not so much to his unstained reputation as to his manifestly impaired health. In fact, he died on the tenth day after his enthronement, Oct. 18, 1503. He had permitted Cæsar Borgia to return, and thus left the city of Rome in grievous confusion under the strife between him and the Orsini and Colonna.

K. Benrath.

Bibliography: Pastor, *Popes*, vi. 185–208; Creighton, *Papacy*, v. 61–67; F. Petruccelli della Gattina, *Hist. diplomatique des conclaves*, i. 435 sqq., Paris, 1864; F. Gregorovius, *Geschichte der Stadt Rom*, viii. 4 sqq., Stuttgart, 1874; A. von Reumont, *Geschichte der Stadt Rom*, iii. 2, pp. 7 sqq., Berlin, 1878; Piccolomini, in *Archivio storica Italico*, v. 32, 102–103, Florence, 1903; Bower, *Popes*, iii. 277–278.

Pius IV. (Giovanni Angelo Medici): Pope 1560–1565. He was derived not from the Florentine Medici but from a Milanese family, was elected pope at the age of sixty years in Dec., 1559, and was enthroned as Pius IV. on Epiphany, 1560.

Unlike his predecessor Paul IV. (q.v.), whose

policy had been passionately hostile to Spain, he turned toward the Austro-Spanish house. By nature he was the counterpart to that somber man who had reorganized the inquisition at Rome, perceiving therein the best instrument of his domination. Pius IV was affable, benevolent, and of simple manners. Yet it was his lot, soon after his ascension to the throne, to inflict the extreme penalty of the law upon the two nephews of his predecessor. One of them, the duke of Paliano, besides other deeds of violence, had caused thirty vassals of the hostile Colonna family to be imprisoned, and atrociously made away with his wife's paramour, as well as herself. The evidence against him inculpated in like degree his brother, Cardinal Caraffa. When the trial proceedings had lasted eight months, the pope himself gave the decision, in a sealed order at the final session, imposing the death sentence upon both, which was carried out Mar. 6, 1561. Under Pius V., however, the trial was reviewed, the stigma upon the two brothers was removed, and the promoter of the trial was himself condemned to death.

Nepotism in the Curia was radically abolished by Pius IV., who contrived to extract large sums of money from the States of the Church and from the ecclesiastical administration, and allotted considerable amounts to his adherents, though he never yielded to them special influence in State or Church. His weightiest concern was the reopening of the Council of Trent (q.v.), the result of which was no less gratifying to the Curia than it was disappointing to Emperor Ferdinand. For even though the emperor refused to acknowledge its decrees, and though not until later, and subject to the guaranteed rights of his crown, were these decrees acknowledged by King Philip II., while the French parliament assumed an expectant stand, yet during the council and by virtue of it, Pius IV removed all dangers that threatened the papal absolutism within the Church. When, in 1564, he solemnly published the council's decrees and imposed upon the bishops the *Professio fidei Tridentinæ* (see TRIDENTINE PROFESSION OF FAITH) as a matter of obligation, he could do so in the consciousness that the papal theory had now conquered effectually. Hence the contingency of apostasy without was indemnified within the Church by a centralization of ecclesiastical economy such as laid all the lines of administration, jurisdiction, and doctrinal finality in the sole hands of the pope.

Destiny placed Pius IV. between two popes who stand as the most impassioned persecutors of heretics in that century, Paul IV and Pius V For he is not the equal of these in furtherance of the inquisition and in persecution of heretics. Yet where opportunity offered, he showed himself ready for that object; and it was he who facilitated the conflict in the literary arena by devising the expedient of the *Index librorum prohibitorum*, so named by him in 1564. K. BENRATH.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Onuphrius Panvinius, *De summis pontificibus continuatio*, Bonona, 1599; Ranke, *Popes*, i. 241 sqq., iii. nos. 31–40; M. Brosch, *Geschichte des Kirchenstaates*, vol. i., Gotha, 1880; F. H. Reusch, *Index der verboten Bücher*, passim Bonn, 1885; Bower, *Popes*, iii. 319–320; and the literature under TRENT, COUNCIL OF.

Pius V. (Michele Ghislieri): Pope 1566–72. He was born at Bosco near Alessandria (48 m. e.s.e. of Turin), and both as cardinal and as pope conceived his main task to be the detection and annihilation of heresy. He belonged to the Dominican order, to which this activity was particularly committed. After some earlier inquisitorial service about Milan, he was drawn to Rome by Caraffa in 1550 (see PAUL IV.), who conferred on him the cardinalate and appointed him director of the Roman inquisition. He owed his election as pope (Jan. 8, 1566) to Cardinal Borromeo and other exponents of the very strictest trend in the sacred college. The Roman populace felt due fear on hearing that "Frà Michele dell' Inquisizione" had ascended the papal throne. In fact, no pope applied so indefatigably every agency for annihilating the heretics. Both in and out of Italy, he was incessantly exhorting or threatening governments to make them accommodating to this end. And the consequence was favorable to him, especially in the Italian peninsula. During the six years of his pontificate, Protestantism in Italy was deprived of its last vestige of strength; its prominent advocates being either killed or driven away (see ITALY, REFORMATION IN). In France, Catherine de' Medici and Charles IX. were at his command. He fortified the Spanish king in his measures against the Netherlands, and sent to the duke of Alva the consecrated hat and sword.

Yet according to Roman Catholic apprehension, this foe of "heretics" was a very pious man, and in Rome he insisted on the most stringent ecclesiastical discipline, imposing heavy penalties for desecration of festival days. No physician was to continue treating a patient critically ill, unless that patient's certificate of confession be produced on the third day for inspection. Whoever, among the higher clergy, combined an ascetic life with strictness toward the nether clergy, was regarded as the right man, as in the case of Carlo Borromeo.

Toward the close of his labors he was destined also to achieve a notable success in statecraft. Like so many of his predecessors, he headed an action against the Turks, which Venice and Spain assisted with their naval forces, and the work was crowned by the brilliant victory of Lepanto (Oct. 7, 1571).

Pius V died on May 1, 1572, and was canonized by Clement XI. K. BENRATH.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. G. G. Catena, *Vita del Papa Pio V.*, Rome, 1587; Ranke, *Popes*, i. 269 sqq., iii., no. 43; J. Quétif and J. Échard, *Scriptores ordinis Prædicatorum*, ii. 220, Paris, 1721; J. Mendham, *Life and Pontificate of . . Pius V.*, London, 1832; A. F. P. Comte de Falloux, *Hist. de . . Pie V.*, 2 vols., Angers, 1844; T. M. Granallo, *Frà Michele Ghislieri, o San Pio V.*, Bologna, 1877; F. H. Reusch, *Index der verbotenen Bücher*, Bonn, 1885; C. A. Joyau, *Saint Pie V., pape du rosaire*, Poitiers, 1892; P. A. Farochan, *Cheypre et Léfante, St. Pie V. et Don Juan d'Autriche*, Paris, 1894 (profusely illustrated); U. Papa, *Un Dissidio tra Venezia e Pio V.*, Venice, 1895; B. A. H. Wilberforce, *St. Pius V.*, London, 1896; Bower, *Popes*, iii. 320, 484–489; Pastor, *Popes*, viii. 432 sqq.

Pius VI. (Giovanni Angelo Braschi): Pope 1775–1799. He was born at Cesena (57 m. n.e. of Florence) Dec. 27, 1717. After a course in jurisprudence, he entered the clerical vocation, and in 1740 went to Rome with his uncle, auditor to Cardinal Ruffo. Years later, he reappears as secretary to

Benedict XIV. and canon at St. Peter's. He was created cardinal in 1773 by Clement XIV., with whom he did not sympathize in the principal ques on connected with his name, that is, suppression of the Jesuit order in 1773 (see JESUITS, II., § 8).

Election and Policy.

When the conclave assembled after Clement's death, the cardinal's election was vigorously resisted from several quarters which employed even personal calumniation, and his election was reached only after the conclave had sat for four months. The Romans received him coolly. Yet though the more zealous faction hoped for immediate restoration of the Jesuit order, Pius VI. considered himself circumscribed to a policy of expectation and waiting in order not to become involved in disputes with Spain, France, and other states.

At first, the pope turned his attention to the elevation of the morality of the clergy in Rome. Before long, however, he was diverted to affairs at a distance, first, in Germany. In that country the movement which was associated with the work of Febronius (see HONTHEIM, JOHANN NIKOLAUS VON) had circulated extensively, though it had been placed on the Index in 1764. Meanwhile the true authorship, concealed under the pseudonym, had become known. Inasmuch as Pius VI. had correctly described, in an address dated Sept. 24, 1775, the bearings of the movement upon the Roman Church, he now commissioned the elector of Treves to constrain the author to retract, and the form of retraction was to comprehend the statement of its purely voluntary character. This experiment proved successful, for the author was a broken old man, then (1778) nearly fourscore years old. However, in other quarters there asserted itself the spirit which had prompted Hontheim, in the form of Josephinism (see JOSEPH II.).

German and Austrian Difficulties.

But though Pius VI. perceived things clearly and was prepared to retaliate, he neither approved nor yet abruptly reversed the first procedure of Joseph II., who withdrew the Austrian cloisters from submission to the supreme control of foreign generals of monastic orders. Even when Garampi, his nuncio at Vienna, in Dec., 1781, met with a brusk rebuff from Count Kaunitz, on the score of his instructive *Promemoria* to the emperor—the pope still believed he could attain every purpose through personal intervention. So in the spring of 1782 he journeyed to Vienna, but every attempt to draw the emperor and his minister from the path of reform continued fruitless. The enthusiastic speeches, in turn, which the Roman Catholic population addressed to the pope on occasion of his awe-commanding appearance in Vienna, Munich, and Augsburg nowise availed to console him over the miscarriage of his attempt. This is apparent from the brief to the emperor, dated Aug. 3, 1782, with its rather patent affirmation that " those who lay their hands on the goods of the Church belong to hell." He seemed afterward more conciliatory; but in Sept., 1783, he was provoked afresh by the emperor's arbitrary course in appointing, as though he were the sole authority, a bishop for Milan. When, therefore, Joseph II. was confronted with the prospect of excommunication, he answered that his holiness might anyhow deign to visit the becoming punishment upon the individual who had made so bold as to misuse his name by forging a document. Without awaiting reply, the emperor next announced his visit to Rome, which came to pass in January, 1784. And at last Pius gained the point which had been so vehemently contested, namely, that the appointment to the episcopal sees in Lombardy be conceded to him. He continued the reforms in church conditions in Austria. After the Congress of Ems (see EMS, CONGRESS OF) had completed its sittings, and the electors transmitted to the emperor the Ems Proviso, Joseph II. made answer that they could reckon upon his cooperation in execution of the same. And yet they had there decidedly emphasized the sole prerogative of the archbishops in matters of reform. At all events, the pope easily became master of the Ems resolutions, as not only the bishops in Germany, but even one of the members of the Congress, the archbishop of Mainz, went over to the papal camp. In order to secure the Curia's acquiescence in the election of a coadjutor, he offered the Ems Proviso by way of exchange; wherein he was followed, down to 1789, by the other participants in the Congress. In short, they transformed the drafted resolutions into very modest petitions. In the case of the king of Prussia, Frederick William II., who had been accommodating to the pope in connection with Mainz, Pius VI. accorded him the reward of no longer thenceforth withholding from him the title of king.

Even while premonitory signs of the French Revolution were perceptible, the pope still gained a victory over Joseph's reform attempts. In what was then Austrian Belgium, the closure of the episcopal seminaries (1786) had evoked great agitation, also actively fomented by the papal nuncio. And though Joseph II. dismissed the nuncio from that country, this measure did not stay the outbreak of actual insurrection any more than did the repeal of the closure itself, together with a propitiatory word from the pope. For the provinces proclaimed their independence, and there stepped to the front as president the pope's thoroughly devoted cardinal-primate Frankenberg. Joseph II. died in 1790. Subsequently, church concerns in the Austrian hereditary lands were once again made thoroughly conformable to papalistic grooves, barring some slight provisional modification at the hands of Emperor Leopold II. Still more serious for Pius VI. appeared to be the trend of ecclesiastical conditions in Tuscany under the Grand Duke Leopold I. The latter, under date of Jan. 26, 1786, issued a circular to the Tuscan bishops proposing fifty-seven reforms; for instance, convocation of diocesan synods, improvement of clerical studies, segregation of suspicious relics, diminution of processions, and the like. Seven bishops assented on principle, among them Ricci of Pistoja (see RICCI, SCIPIONE DE'), who then also submitted these points to a synod convening at Pistoja in Sept., 1786, and effected their immediate acceptance. On the other hand, a protest was raised by the bishops generally, through the chan-

Affairs in Belgium and Italy.

nel of the Tuscan Council (Apr.–June, 1787). And as Leopold I. kept adhering to his plans of reform, there ensued a conflict with the pope; while, in turn, the Tuscan envoy was recalled from Rome. It was only when Leopold ascended the imperial throne (1790) that these complications reached an end; Ricci resigned, and Ferdinand III. receded. Nor was the situation less grave, as affecting the pope, in the kingdom of Naples. In 1779, the royal *exequatur* was refused to quite a series of papal briefs; in 1780, the king claimed a general patronal right over the benefices, then over the bishoprics; in 1782, the tribunal of the inquisition was dissolved in Sicily; while from 1788, the custom was discontinued, of long centuries' duration though it had been, of offering a tent and the so-called "feudal tribute" at the festival of SS. Peter and Paul. By and by the number of unoccupied bishoprics became so large that in 1791 the pope at last conceded the king's right of presentation of three candidates, whereupon sixty-two episcopal sees were supplied.

Conflict with France.

The outbreak of the French Revolution (q.v.) involved most incisive consequences for the Church. The "civil constitution of the clergy," still proposed for acceptance under Louis XVI., was rejected by Pius VI.; and, in fact, 50,000 priests, following the precedent of 130 bishops, refused the oath in connection with this new ruling. Thereupon, in Sept., 1791, the National Assembly answered by annexing Avignon and Venaissin. Then when a secretary of the French embassy in Rome had been assassinated there by the rabble, in 1793, and when the pope took part in the coalition against France, Bonaparte declared war on him, advanced upon Rome, and compelled Pius VI., during the truce of Bologna, 1796, to relinquish a large part of the States of the Church (see Papal States). When disturbances were renewed, General Berthier occupied Rome in 1798; and had Pius VI., who was ill, transported first to Florence, then to Valence, where he died Aug. 29, 1799. K. Benrath.

Bibliography: For his bulls, etc., consult either N. S. Guillon's *Collection générale des brefs et instructions de . Pie VI.*, 2 vols., Paris, 1798; the *Collectio brevium* . of L. H. Halot, 2 parts, Rome, 1800; or the *Collectio bullarum, brevium* . . , London, 1803. For his life and acts consult: Ranke, *Popes*, ii. 453 sqq., iii. no. 165; P. P. Wolf, *Geschichte der römisch-katholischen Kirche unter . Pius VI.*, 7 vols., Zurich, 1793–1802; G. de Novaes, *Storia de' sommi Pontefici*, Rome, 1822; P. Baldassari, *Hist. de l'enlèvement et de la captivité de Pie VI.*, Paris, 1839; F. Beccatini, *Storia di Pio VI.*, 4 vols., Venice, 1841; G. C. Cordare, *De Profectu Pii VI. ad aulam Viennensem*, ed. J. Boërus, Rome, 1855; F. Petrucelli della Gattina, *Hist. diplomatique des conclaves*, iv. 211 sqq., Paris, 1866; A. von Reumont, *Geschichte der Stadt Rom*, iii. 2, pp. 660 sqq., Berlin, 1870; A. M. de Franclieu, *Pie VI. dans les prisons du Dauphiné*, Grenoble, 1878; I. Bertrand, *Le Pontificat de Pie VI. et l'athéisme révolutionnaire*, Paris, 1879; F. H. Reusch, *Index der verbotenen Bücher*, vol. ii., Bonn, 1885; H. Schletter, *Die Reise des Papstes Pius VI. nach Wien*, and *Pius VI. und Josef II.*, 2 vols., Vienna, 1892–94 (valuable for the literature named); *Pie VI., sa vie, son pontificat (1717–99)*, Paris, 1907; Nippold, *Papacy*, pp. 20, 36; Bower, *Popes*, iii. 390–419.

Pius VII. (Luigi Chiaramonti): Pope 1800–23. He was born at Cesena (57 m. n.e. of Florence) Aug. 14, 1740. At the age of sixteen he entered the Benedictine order, became a lecturer in the cloister at Parma and later in Rome. His predecessor made him bishop of Tivoli, then of Imola, and in 1785, cardinal. When the French army approached Imola, he still maintained his residence in his episcopal city. On that occasion (1797), he contrived to save the town from spoliation and even maintained good terms with Republican powers.

Shortly before he was taken captive, Pius VI. had prescribed that the conclave should be held in that city in the neighborhood of which the most cardinals might happen to be at his death, only not in Rome. So they assembled in Venice, and on Mar. 14, 1800, Chiaramonti was elected unanimously, and in July he entered Rome as Pius VII. For secretary of state he appointed Cardinal Ercole Consalvi (q.v.), whose first achievement of note was the conclusion of the concordat with France (see Concordats and Delimiting Bulls, VI., § 1), which restored most of its rights to the Roman Catholic Church, and annulled episcopal power in favor of the papal absolute supremacy. However, in virtue of the "Organic Articles" (1802), the first consul deprived these concessions of nearly all significance, insomuch that the pope protested. Yet both sides wished to avoid a rupture, and in the following year, Pius VII. appointed the consul's uncle (Joseph Fesch, q.v.) a cardinal.

Meanwhile in Germany, when by terms of the peace of Lunéville, in 1801, the left bank of the Rhine had fallen to France, the secularization of the temporal dominions of the Church was brought to pass despite every protest; and the Elector Dalberg of Mainz, against the will of the Curia, was elected primate of Germany. Even thus early, Napoleon put forth still greater demands, as, when the senate had named him hereditary ruler of France, he desired the pope to consummate the imperial coronation. Reluctantly, but yet in the hope of thereby gaining concessions for the Church, Pius VII. performed the ceremony of anointing (Dec. 2, 1804), but when he was about to place the crown on the sovereign's head, Napoleon forestalled him, crowned himself, and placed the diadem on the head of his consort, Josephine. All demands by the pope on occasion of this journey came to naught; what satisfaction he felt was on account of the deportment of the French people, who were charmed by his presence. At Florence, on his return journey, he received the full submission of Bishop Ricci of Pistoja (see Ricci, Scipione de').

But heavy clouds were gathering from France. The emperor demanded the dissolution of his brother Jerome's marriage, desiring Jerome to marry a princess—a prelude to his own course later. When the pope firmly refused, Napoleon declared the marriage dissolved. In 1808, he managed to find occasion to occupy Rome; in 1809, he declared it a French city; and when for this reason he was put under the ban, he had the pope and Cardinal Pacca carried captive to Savona. But even here Pius VII. would not bend, and refused the confirmation of the French bishops appointed by the emperor until finally the enervating torments of his captivity induced him to an oral assent. But when, owing to continued confinement at Fontainebleau, the tor-

mented old man, on Jan. 25, 1813, agreed to a concordat both surrendering Rome and voicing the confirmation of the bishops designated by the emperor, Cardinals Consalvi and Pacca, who hastened to the spot, succeeded in moving him to solemn retraction. Napoleon's own fate had meanwhile turned; the year 1814 gave the captive his freedom again; and on May 24 he triumphantly entered Rome. The restoration of the Jesuits and of the Congregation of the Index, together with Consalvi's activity at the Congress of Vienna, effectually reinstated the Roman Catholic Church both within and without; while by the terms of sundry favorable concordats, the pope guaranteed large advantages to the states of Central Europe.

At the close of his life, Pius VII. found himself once again involved in conflict, this time with Spain and Portugal. In that quarter, the revolution and the liberal government of 1820 had not only abolished the settlements of the Jesuits, but also those of most of the remaining orders, and ruptured diplomatic relations were the result. The French, however, suppressed the revolution, and King Ferdinand VII. proclaimed the abrogation of all acts against the Church (1823). This happened also in Portugal, where Dom Miguel, at the same time, put an end to liberalism.

The Rome of the second phase of the pontificate of Pius VII. became the goal of artists of all nations. Crowned heads, as well, sought the city, and the venerable pontiff was visited by Emperor Francis II. of Austria (1819); by the king of Naples; and by King Frederick William III. of Prussia, while Charles IV of Spain and Emanuel of Savoy made Rome their permanent residence. The city was thus enveloped with new splendor; and Pius VII., who died on Aug. 21, 1823, is commemorated still by that part of the Vatican sculpture museum which bears his name Chiaramonti. K. Benrath.

Bibliography: The bulls are in the *Bullarii Romani continuatio* of Barberi, vols. xi.–xv., Rome, 1846–53. Consult: Ranke, *Popes*, ii. 461 sqq., 466 sqq., 539 sqq.; E. Pistolesi, *Vita del . Pio VII.*, 2 vols., Rome, 1824; H. Simon, *Vie politique et privée de Pie VII.*, 2 vols., Paris, 1823; Jäger, *Lebensbeschreibung des Papstes Pius VII. mit Urkunden*, Frankfort, 1824; A. F. Artaud de Montor, *Hist. du pape Pie VII.*, 3 vols., Paris, 1839; B. Pacca, *Historical Memoirs*, 2 vols., London, 1850; idem, *Mémoires sur le pontificat de Pie VII.*, 2 vols., Paris, 1884; N. P. S. Wiseman, *Recollections of the last Four Popes*, London, 1858; A. Gavazzi, *My Recollections of the last Four Popes*, London, 1858; J. Bohl, *Pius VII. en zijn Tijd*, 2 vols., Rotterdam, 1861; F. Petrucelli della Gattina, *Hist. diplomatique des conclaves*, iv. 282 sqq., Paris, 1866; A. Theiner, *Hist. des deux concordats de la république française et de la république cisalpine*, 2 vols., Bar-le-Duc, 1869; A. von Reumont, *Geschichte der Stadt Rom*, iii. 2, pp. 665 sqq., Berlin, 1870; O. Mejer, *Zur Geschichte der römisch-deutschen Frage*, vols. i.–iii. passim, Rostock, 1871–73; D. Bertollotti, *Vita di Papa Pio VII.*, Turin, 1881; F. H. Reusch, *Index der verbotenen Bücher*, vol. ii., Bonn, 1885; H. Chotard, *Le Pape Pie VII. à Savone*, Paris, 1887; Mary H. Allies, *Pius VII.*, London, 1897; F. Nippold, *Handbuch der neuesten Kirchengeschichte*, ii. 15–70, Berlin, 1901; L. König, *Die Säkularisation und das Reichskonkordat*, Innsbruck, 1904; H. Welschinger, *Le Pape et l'empereur, 1804–15*, Paris, 1905; Nielsen, *Papacy*; Nippold, *Papacy*, passim; Pastor, *Popes*, viii. 299; Bower, *Popes*, iii. 419–434; and the literature under Concordats and Delimiting Bulls.

Pius VIII. (Francesco Saverio Castiglioni): Pope 1829-30. He was born at Cingoli (102 m. e.s.e. of Florence) Nov. 20, 1761. The principal event of his brief pontificate was the Emancipation Act of Apr. 23 [13], 1829, in favor of English Catholics, though this did not have the pope's cooperation. In the case of the contest just then breaking out with the Prussian government, Pius VIII. allowed the clerical *assistentia passiva*, where there was no guaranty for the bringing up of all the children as Roman Catholics. This concession was revoked by his successor. When the Bourbons were expelled from France in the July revolution, and Louis Philippe was instituted king, the pope reluctantly acknowledged the reversal. K. Benrath.

Bibliography: The bulls are in the *Bullarii Romani continuatio* of Barberi, vol. xviii., Rome, 1856; for the Brief of Mar. 25, 1830, cf. Mirbt, *Quellen*, pp. 350 sqq. Consult: A. F. Artaud de Montor, *Hist. du pape Pie VIII.*, Paris, 1844; A. Gavazzi, *My Recollections of the last Four Popes*, London, 1858; N. P. S. Wiseman, *Recollections of the last Four Popes*, London, 1858; M. Brosch, *Geschichte des Kirchenstaates*, ii. 316 sqq., Gotha, 1882; F. H. Reusch, *Index der verbotenen Bücher*, vol. ii. passim, Bonn, 1885; F. Nippold, *Handbuch der neuesten Kirchengeschichte*, ii. 79 sqq., Berlin, 1901; Bower, *Popes*, iii. 464–470; Nippold, *Papacy*, passim; Nielsen, *Papacy*, passim.

Pius IX. (Giovanni Mastai Ferretti): Pope 1846-1878. He was born at Sinigaglia (70 m. s.e. of Ravenna) May 13, 1792. He studied in the Collegium Romanum, was made priest, and labored for several years in Chile. In 1827 he became bishop of Spoleto, then of Imola, and obtained the cardinalate in 1840. Elected by 34 (37?) votes, in the conclave following the death of Gregory XVI., Pius IX. found himself confronted with extremely difficult tasks. The administration of the Papal States (q.v.) had everywhere aroused the utmost dissatisfaction; and the cities of the eastward half—Ancona, Bologna, and Ravenna—clamored for reforms. The pope's character and presence appeared to warrant such progress, and it was hoped that he might even assist in the unification of the entire nation, which was demanded on every side.

Good will for the amelioration of existing conditions attended him from the outset. He curtailed the expenses of the papal court, though in connection with the civil administration he could not persuade himself to break with the system according to which the governing officials were to belong almost without exception to the clerical body. He refused the patriots' demand for some action toward eliminating the Austrians from the Italian peninsula, resolving not to declare war on Austria, although his troops were already united with the Piedmont troops; but, in his address of Apr. 29, 1848, he took shelter behind the pronouncement that "conformably to our apostolic rank, we embrace all nations with like love."

Though it proved not feasible to laicize the administration of public affairs throughout the Papal States, in Rome the lay element was to be more strongly represented in the common council; some non-clerics also took seats in the council of state (*consulta*). This did not meet the impetuous demand for a constitution and for institution of secular ministers. Yet on May 4, 1848, upon adjustment of the membership of the Consulta in the proportion of six laymen to three clerics, a patriotic president of council was accepted in the person of

Terenzo Mamiani; but in view of the conflict that soon ensued with the Curia's executive experience and wisdom, Mamiani perceived himself constrained to withdraw. His successor, Count Rossi, was assassinated, and in order to escape the tumult, Pius IX. fled from Rome to Gaeta. From that base he rejected the suggestion of the Piedmontese that he allow them to restore the Papal States as a constitutional monarchy. This was done by the French in 1849, but not under those conditions. Hardly had Pius IX. returned (Apr., 1850) when he inaugurated an era of uncompromising reaction, marked, for instance, by the incident that in Bologna alone, down to 1856, the " court of summary justice " had executed by shooting 276 " culprits."

The administration of the Papal States was now conducted by Antonelli (q.v.) on a thoroughly clerical basis. In the department of finance, individuals, including Antonelli, enriched themselves; nothing was done in the matter of public instruction to reduce the scandalous illiteracy of the land; while in the department of justice arbitrary ruling was rife. In short, the Papal States remained the worst administered political fabric in Europe, while trade and industry were in wretched condition. In the distinctly ecclesiastical sphere, wherein Pius IX., in 1854, conceived the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of Mary (q.v.), without taking counsel of the Church, he tested the point as to how far the bishops would conform to his bidding. At the same time, in relation to civil governments, he carried most of his demands through the medium of concordats (with Spain, 1851; Austria, 1855; also with lesser German States; see CONCORDATS AND DELIMITING BULLS). In Italy, however, the unification project, supported by Piedmont, now so successfully asserted itself against the pope that its several stages were completely accomplished (victory over Austria, 1859; Victor Emanuel, king of Italy, 1860; September treaty, 1864) even down to the conquest of Rome, in 1870. It is memorable that the last step in the process was achieved shortly after the momentous date when the Vatican Council (q.v.) had declared the infallibility of the pope, July 18, 1870.

To be sure, the occupation of Rome by the Italian army was by no means intended to banish the pope from that city thereafter. They suffered him the narrowly circumscribed " sovereignty " of the Vatican; and even offered him, in the stipulation law of 1871, an annual income of 3,250,000 francs. But Pius IX. rejected this offer, feigned a state of captivity, and a limitation upon his action which soon became subjects of derision; for it appeared, as in the contest with Prussia, that the Curia had grown more free than formerly in the matter of safeguarding its ecclesiastical interests. The last years of Pius' pontificate are largely filled with this contest, he himself having given the challenge in that address of the spring of 1871 wherein he threatened Prussia with the " stone " of her destined shattering. Yet even this contest (so grave in its results and not finally appeased until Leo XIII., q.v., came into power) did not prevent the brilliant celebration of two jubilees of Pius IX. In 1871 he celebrated the twenty-fifth anniversary of his pontificate, whereby he had attained to the " years of Peter "; and in 1877 his jubilee proper, or fiftieth year in the priesthood. On this occasion he beheld the whole Roman Catholic world at his feet. Indeed, he surpassed the " years of Peter " by seven years, dying on Feb. 7, 1878. He and his secretary of state Antonelli did not achieve the restoration of the temporal sovereignty, but they bequeathed such a heritage to the following pontiff as he well understood how profitably to occupy to the Church's advantage.

K. BENRATH.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sources of information for the pontificate are the *Acta Pie IX.*, 4 vols., Rome, 1854 sqq.; *Acta sanctæ sedis*, ib. 1865 sqq.; *Acta et decreta sanctorum conciliorum*, vol. vi., Freiburg, 1882. A collection of this pope's encyclicals was published in Freiburg, 1881 sqq., and of his " Apostolic Letters," 2 vols., Paris, 1893. A large literature is indicated in the *British Museum Catalogue*, under " Rome, Church of," cols. 332 sqq., and under Pius IX. Consult: Mirbt, *Quellen*, pp. 360–390 sqq.; M. Marocco, *Storia di Pio IX.*, 2 vols., Turin, 1856–59; H. Reuchlin, *Geschichte Italiens*, vols. i., iii., iv., Leipsic, 1859–73; F. Liverani, *Il Papato, l'Impero e il Regno d'Italia*, Florence, 1861; A. Gennarelli, *Le Sventure ital. durante il Pontificato di Pio IX.*, Florence, 1863; A. O. Legge, *Pius IX.*, 2 vols., London, 1872; Abbé Gillet, *Pie IX., sa vie et les acts de son pontificat*, Paris, 1877; T. A. Trollope, *Story of the Life of Pius IX.*, 2 vols., London, 1877; J. G. Shea, *Life of Pius IX. and the Great Events of his Pontificate*, New York, 1878; J. M. Stepischnegg, *Fürstbischof von Lavant, Papst Pius IX.*, 2 vols., Vienna, 1879; A. M. Dawson, *Pius IX. and his Times*, Toronto, 1880; C. Sylvain, *Hist. de Pie IX.*, 3 vols., Lille, 1883; F. H. Reusch, *Index der verbotenen Bücher*, passim, 2 vols., Bonn, 1885; A. Pougeois, *Hist. de Pie IX.*, 6 vols., Paris, 1886; J. F. Maguire, *Pius IX. and his Times*, London, 1893; M. Pagès, *Pie IX., sa vie, ses écrits, sa doctrine*, Paris, 1895; E. Gebhart, *Moines et papes (Alexander VI. and Pius IX.)*, Paris, 1896; F. Nippold, *Handbuch der neuesten Kirchengeschichte*, ii. 102–155, Berlin, 1901; J. Fernandez Montaña, *El Syllabus de Pio IX.*, Madrid, 1905; J. H. Robinson and C. A. Beard, *Development of Modern Europe*, vol. ii. passim, New York, 1908; R. de Cesare, *The Last Days of Papal Rome, 1850–70*, Boston, 1909; Nippold, *Papacy*, pp. 113 sqq.; Nielsen, *Papacy*. Use also the literature under INFALLIBILITY OF THE POPE; ULTRAMONTANISM; and VATICAN COUNCIL.

Pius X. (Giuseppe Melchior Sarto): Pope since 1903. He was born at Riese (a village near Castelfranco, 25 m. n.w. of Venice), Italy, June 2, 1835. His parents were in humble circumstances and their family was large, but such were the talents of the future pope that every effort was made for his education. His early training was received in the gymnasium at the neighboring town of Castelfranco, and in 1850 he entered the Seminary of Padua, where he remained seven years, being ordained to the priesthood in 1858. He was immediately appointed curate in Tombolo, in the diocese of Treviso, where he remained until 1867, when he was called to take control of the parish of Salzano. In 1875 he was made canon of Treviso, and three years later was appointed director of the episcopal chancellery and vicar general of the diocese. Meanwhile his talents were rapidly gaining recognition, and in 1882 he was consecrated bishop of Mantua, where he found an evil condition of affairs, made still worse by the attacks of the Italian government, which from 1871 to 1879 had rendered exercise of episcopal functions impossible. Within the eleven years of his bishopric, Sarto transformed the diocese of Mantua into a model see, and his labors

found their fitting reward in 1893, when he was created patriarch of Venice and cardinal priest of San Bernardo. There he remained until in 1903 he was elected pope to succeed Leo XIII. (q.v.). The most striking features of the new pope's reign thus far have been the official promotion of the use of the Gregorian chant throughout all churches of the Roman Catholic communion, the separation by the French government of Church and State (1905; see FRANCE), the attack upon critical tendencies in the Church (see MODERNISM; and cf. LOS VON ROM), and a serious dispute with Spain, one object of which on the part of the Spanish government is the control of the religious orders necessitated by the settlement of monks and nuns exiled from France.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *Pie X-Actes-encycliques-motu proprio, brefs, allocutions, etc. Texte latin avec la traduction française en regard précédés d'une notice biographique suivi d'une table générale alphabétique*, 3 vols., Paris, 1906–09; A. de Waal, *Papst Pius X.; Lebensbild*, Munich, 1903, Eng. transl., *Life of Pope Pius X.*, Milwaukee, 1904; A. Marchesan, *Papst Pius X. in Leben und Wort*, Einsiedeln, 1906; N. Peters, *Papst Pius X. und das Bibelstudien*, Paderborn, 1906; A. Hoch, *Papst Pius X. Ein Bild kirchlicher Reformthätigkeit*, Leipsic, 1907; W. E. Schmitz [Didier], *The Life of Pope Pius X.*, New York, 1908; B. Sentzer, *Pius X.*, Graz, 1908; N. Hilling, *Die Reformen des Papstes Pius X. auf dem Gebiet der kirchenrechtlichen Gesetzgebung*, Bonn, 1909; and the literature under MODERNISM.

PIUS SOCIETIES: Certain religious associations, composed of clergy and laity, formed in Germany after the revolutionary disturbances of 1848, the object of which was the defense and promotion of Roman Catholicism in Germany. The bishops of the Roman Catholic Church assembled at Würzburg in 1848, agreed to support the Pius Societies, so called after Pius IX. (q.v.), to maintain the supremacy of the pope in Germany and to keep national education in the hands of the Church. In Oct., 1848, a meeting representing many local unions was held at Mainz in which all the Pius Societies throughout the country were incorporated in one collective union which took the name of the "Catholic Union of Germany." The object of this association was declared to be the treatment of all social and religious questions from a Roman Catholic standpoint, and especially the preservation and promotion of the Church's welfare and independence. The union was pronounced by the bishop of Limburg to be "a powerful lever for the Christian restoration of Germany." At this meeting were formed the Vincent societies for domestic missionary work, and later Boniface societies, which, together with a host of societies either new or previously in existence, became adjuncts of the Pius Societies.

The assemblies were always made occasions for commenting on the condition of the Roman Catholic Church in Germany, for preaching Ultramontanism (q.v.), and inveighing against Protestantism. During the trials of the so-called Kulturkampf (see ULTRAMONTANISM) the Pius Societies at their annual meeting at Würzburg, 1877, resolved: "We will fight not with the sword but with the cross." This peaceful attitude gave way after 1880 to a more stormy program, including the ultramontane policy of Pius IX., the readmittance of Roman Catholic orders, particularly the Jesuits, and the temporal supremacy of the pope. The Pius Societies do not aim at a parity of privileges among all religious bodies, but at the total catholicization of the German nation in accordance with the introduction of that future ideal when, in the words of Baron von Loë uttered in the Roman Catholic Assembly at Bonn in 1881: "Germany shall be a Catholic country and the Church the leader of the nations." (O. ZÖCKLER†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: From the Roman Catholic side may be adduced: H. Menne, *Ueber den Zweck und Nutzen der katholische Vereine Deutschlands*, Osnabrück, 1848; T. Palatinus, *Entstehung der Generalversammlung der Katholiken Deutschlands*, Würzburg, 1893; H. Brück, *Geschichte der katholischen Kirche im 19. Jahrhundert*, iii. 511–537, Münster, 1905. For the Protestant side read: H. Schmid, *Geschichte der katholischen Kirche Deutschlands*, pp. 667, 758 sqq., Munich, 1874; F. Nippold, *Handbuch der neuesten Kirchengeschichte*, ii. 707 sqq., Berlin, 1901.

PLACE, JOSUÉ DE LA. See PLACEUS.

PLACEMAKER'S BIBLE. See BIBLE VERSIONS, B, IV., § 9.

PLACET, plē'set, or plā'set (**PLACETUM REGIUM, REGIUM EXEQUATUR, LITTERÆ PAREATIS):** Formal state approval of measures of ecclesiastical administration, or state provision that only ecclesiastical administrative measures thus approved shall be civilly recognized and maintained.

Development of the Placet.

This presupposes that both State and Church are mutually independent. In the case of a church governed, as the Reformed state church came to be, by the civil power, the *placet* is meaningless; and it is equally inapplicable where the State, in ecclesiastical affairs, is completely dependent on the authority of the Church, as was the case in the Middle Ages from the time of Gregory VII. The *placet*, therefore, first becomes a part of the machinery of the State when the latter begins to revolt from the Church and to deem itself independent. Concomitantly with the development of royal power, this occurred first in Spain, during the reign of Alfonso XI. (1348). In that country, the *placet* had already been formulated in a series of royal ordinances when the Emperor Charles V. ascended the throne and made decisive use of this device with the aid of the Cortes. In France the *placet* did not arise till nearly a century later, there assuming a distinct character through the practical bearings of the French parliaments. The rule that papal bulls gained legal validity only by virtue of the royal *placet* was practically current in France before becoming established by legislation in 1475. In the Netherlands, while the rudiments of the *placet* are very old, it was only in the Spanish period that it was legislatively established (1565), its form here receiving marked influence from Spanish jurisprudence and from the French culture dominant in the Walloon portion of the country.

In so far as these developments arose prior to the Reformation, the Church, like the modern Roman Catholic communion, never acknowledged the civil *placet*, but, in virtue of her divine commission, asserted the prerogative of sole power to prescribe

whatsoever might be deemed necessary for her best interests even in secular affairs, particularly of a legislative character. She accordingly held ecclesiastical requirements to be binding in their very nature, and regarded the State as unreservedly pledged to lend her the support of the secular arm. The bull *In cœna Domini* (1568) pronounces excommunication on all who obstruct the publication and execution of papal bulls and briefs. By the brief *Pervenerat* (June 30, 1830) Pius VIII. rejected the *placet* in dealing with the estates of the ecclesiastical province of the Upper Rhine; and Pius IX. followed the same course in his allocution *Meminit unusquisque* (Sept. 30, 1861), as well as on other occasions, and emphasized it in the *Syllabus* (§ 30). The Roman Catholic Church denies categorically that the State possesses any jurisdiction over things which the Church has declared spiritual, and the Curia and its sympathizers view the use of the *placet* by the State as an act of compulsion to which they must submit so long as there is no feasible way to overcome it. By the State these ecclesiastical pronouncements were long disregarded. When the bull *In cœna Domini* (q.v.) was published in Spain without royal approbation, Philip II. retaliated with most stringent measures; and the *placet* was also upheld by his successors. In France, jurisprudence and legislation alike developed this legal instrument even down to concrete details; and only when the enactment of the Church was concerned with religion alone was there no need of State approval. The French theory, modified by the Belgian development of Hispano-Gallican theory and practise, was also of essential influence upon the evolution of German jurisprudence.

Mutual Attitude of Church and State.

As a logical consequence of the social freedom guaranteed by a constitutional government, associations for religious purposes regulate and, so far as their social means permit, control their own affairs. Similar freedom is enjoyed by the Roman Catholic Church. Here the *placet* has no place as long as the State is not bidden to transcend its own sphere, which it alone can gage, and to protect the special interests of the Church; or so long as its own interests do not lead it to restrict the freedom of the Roman Catholic Church. The Church, on the other hand, neither recognizes any limitations of this character, nor does it concede to the State the right to decide how far to further the interests of the Church, but it demands implicit obedience. This double relation of Church and State, which was clear to the former from the first, but only gradually became evident to the latter, conditioned the development of the controversy concerning the *placet* in Germany from the time when constitutional government came to have a distinct meaning.

The Placet in Modern Times.

German states retaining the *placet* are Bavaria, Saxony, Württemberg, Baden, Hesse, Saxe-Weimar, Brunswick, and Saxe-Coburg-Gotha, as well as the imperial provinces of Alsace and Lorraine; though the several state codes diverge considerably as regards details. Officially the Roman Catholic Church never recognizes the *placet;* and in Bavaria, for instance, the church dignitaries have simply ignored it when publishing the Vatican decrees, thus repeatedly giving rise to severe controversies not only regarding the validity of the *placet* in general, but also concerning its validity in the case of dogmas in particular. The theory advanced by influential ultramontane leaders, that the *placet* should be abrogated since Church and State are independent of, though coexistent with, each other, would be correct if the Church were willing to see her ordinances preserved intact simply by the social agencies of her rule in the sphere of conscience. But since, to secure this end, she lays claim, either directly or indirectly, to civil means, this ostensible coexistence practically becomes the Gregorian elevation of the Church above the State. If, therefore, the modern State freely concedes to the Roman Catholic Church the right of regulating its own religious concerns, it can do so only in the sense in which it concedes autonomy of any character, on condition of State supervision, and of the State's consequent right either to approve or to forbid.

Those states which still enforce the *placet* as a special institution make it apply to Protestants as well as to the Roman Catholic Church. Even the states which no longer take cognizance of the *placet* as such are not content with the fact that the sanction of church laws rests in the hands of the territorial sovereign; for in the case of such laws, they require either the countersignature of a minister of state, or preliminary approbation by ministers of state for drafts of such laws. See also Nominatio Regia.

E. Sehling.

Bibliography: The one book of value here is E. Friedberg, *Die Gränzen zwischen Staat und Kirche*, Tübingen, 1872. But see Church and State, and the literature there adduced.

PLACETTE, plā″set′, **JEAN LA:** French Protestant theologian and moralist; b. at Pontacq (118 m. s.s.w. of Bordeaux) Jan. 19, 1639; d. at Utrecht Apr. 25, 1718. He studied theology at the Protestant academy at Montauban; became pastor at Orthez (1660), and at Nay (1664), where he earned a brilliant reputation as an orator; after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes (1685) he became pastor of the French church at Copenhagen, where he labored fruitfully as pastor and as writer till 1711, when he retired and went to live at Utrecht. His writings fall into three classes, those on systematic theology, on morals, and on practical theology. Among those in the former class to be named are: *Observationes historico-ecclesiasticæ* (Amsterdam, 1695); *Traité de la foi divine* (1697); and *Réponse à deux objections sur l'origine du mal et sur le mystère de la Trinité* (1707). In the second class mention may be made of *Nouveaux essais de morale* (1692); a second series with the same title (6 vols., The Hague, 1715); *Le Morale chrétienne* (2 vols., Cologne, 1695); and *Divers traités sur des matières de conscience* (Amsterdam, 1696). In the third class are: *La Mort des justes ou manière de bien mourir* (1695; Eng. transl., *The Death of the Righteous*, 2 vols., London, 1737); *La Communion devoté* (2 vols., 1695); *Traité de la conscience* (1699; Eng. transl., *The Christian Casuist*, London, 1705); and

the posthumous *Avis sur la manière de prêcher* (Rotterdam, 1733; contains a biography).

Bibliography: Beside the life in *Avis* . , ut sup., consult: Niceron, *Mémoires*, vol. ii.; P. A. Sayous, *Hist. de la littérature française à l'étranger*, ii. 211–220, Paris, 1853; Lichtenberger, *ESR*, vii. 741–744.

PLACETUM REGIUM. See Placet.

PLACEUS, plā-sî'us, JOSUA (JOSUÉ DE LA PLACE): French theologian; b. at Saumur (30 m. s.e. of Angers) probably in 1596; d. there Aug. 17, 1665 or 1655. He became pastor at Nantes in 1625 and was professor of theology at his native city from 1633 till his death. Placeus together with M. Amyraut (q.v.) and L. Capellus belong, as followers of John Cameron (q.v.), to that theological movement at Saumur which in contrast with the orthodox school of Sedan sought to moderate the Calvinistic doctrine by emphasizing the ethical and common human elements, without, however, departing from the fundamental principles. From the supreme value of the accountability of every human soul, Placeus especially drew the conclusion against the imputation of Adam's actual sin. In defense of the doctrine that the sin of Adam could be reckoned to his descendants only as mediated by the inherited sinful subjective state he pointed out that Calvin knew nothing of an immediate imputation and that the same was denied by Peter Martyr and Daniel Chamier (q.v.), but did not go so far as to justify himself by the view of Zwingli that hereditary guilt was no more than the guilt of every individual. The national synod of Charenton (1644) under the leadership of Antoine Garissoles (q.v.), representing the over-zealous constituency of Montauban, opposed this assertion by adopting a decree to be subscribed by all pastors and candidates. Placeus issued later his vindication, *Disputatio de imputatione primi peccati Adami* (Saumur, 1655). The national synod of Loudun, in 1659, withdrew all threatening measures of discipline, but the Zurich orthodoxy did not rest content until in the *Formula consensus Helvetici* of 1675 it repudiated with Saumurism as a whole the mere "imputation mediate and consequent." (E. F. Karl Müller.)

Bibliography: The *Opera omnia* were published in 2 vols., Franeker, 1699, Aubencit, 1702. Consult: E. and E. Haag, *La France protestante*, ed. H. L. Bordier, vi. 309 sqq., Paris, 1889; J. G. Walch, *Einleitung in die Religions-Streitigkeiten . ausser der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche*, iii. 890 sqq., Jena, 1734; Bartholmess, in *Bulletin de la société de l'hist. du protestantisme français*, 1853; Saigey, in *Revue de théologie*, Oct., 1855; Lichtenberger, *ESR*, xi. 469 sqq.

PLAGUE. See Diseases and the Healing Art, Hebrew, IV., §§ 4–5.

PLAGUES OF EGYPT. See Moses, § 3.

PLAIN-SONG. See Sacred Music.

PLANCK, GOTTLIEB JAKOB: German Lutheran and church historian; b. at Nürtingen (13 m. s.s.e. of Stuttgart), Württemberg, Nov. 15, 1751; d. at Göttingen Aug. 31, 1833. He was educated at the University of Tübingen (1769–74), where he was a lecturer in 1775–80, after which he went to Stuttgart as vicar, being preacher and associate professor at the Karlsschule in the same city, 1781–1784. Here he completed the first two volumes of his *Geschichte der Entstehung, der Veränderungen und der Bildung unseres protestantischen Lehrbegriffs von Anfang der Reformation bis zur Einführung der Konkordienformel* (6 vols., Leipsic, 1781–1800). So favorable was the reception accorded these volumes that, on the death of Christian Wilhelm Franz Walch in 1784, Planck was chosen to succeed him as professor of church history at Göttingen. He became a member of the consistory in 1791; ephor of the Hanover theologians in 1800; general superintendent of the principality of Göttingen in 1805; abbot of Bursfelde in 1828; and supreme consistorial councilor in 1830.

Planck himself described his theological standpoint as "rational supernaturalism." He held to the divinity as well as to the reasonableness of Christianity, to the necessity as well as to the comprehensibility of a direct divine revelation. He was essentially a historian, and the historical point of view and method colored his whole personality. The first of his two most important works, the *Geschichte unseres protestantischen Lehrbegriffs*, has already been mentioned. His second great work was his *Geschichte der christlich-kirchlichen Gesellschaftsverfassung* (5 vols., Hanover, 1803–09). The first of these two works was undoubtedly Planck's masterpiece, and marked an epoch in the writing of Protestant church history, since it was the earliest attempt at an unpartizan account of the Reformation and of the rise of Lutheranism. Planck has been criticized for emphasizing too strongly the subjective, personal part in the development of ideas. He paid too little attention to general influences and currents of thought that prevailed throughout entire historic periods, though he went deeply and carefully into his sources, and used the knowledge of details thus obtained in presenting extremely graphic delineations of character and motives.

Among the numerous writings of Planck, in addition to those already mentioned, special mention may be made of the following: continuations of the *Neueste Religions-Geschichte* of Christian Wilhelm Franz Walch (q.v.; 3 vols., Lemgo, 1787–93) and the *Bibliothek der Kirchenversammlungen des vierten und fünften Jahrhunderts* of Georg Daniel Fuchs (Leipsic, 1784), as well as a new edition of the *Grundriss der Kirchengeschichte* of Ludwig Timotheus Spittler (q.v.; Göttingen, 1812); *Grundriss einer Geschichte der kirchlichen Verfassung, kirchlichen Regierung und des kanonischen Rechts* (1790); *Einleitung in die theologischen Wissenschaften* (2 parts, Leipsic, 1794–95; Eng. transl., *Introduction to Sacred Philology and Interpretation*, Edinburgh, 1834); *Ueber Trennung und Vereinigung der getrennten christlichen Hauptpartheyen* (Tübingen, 1803); *Betrachtungen über die neuesten Veränderungen in dem Zustand der deutschen katholischen Kirche* (Hanover, 1808); *Worte des Friedens mit der katholischen Kirche* (Göttingen, 1809); *Grundriss der theologischen Encyklopädie* (1813); *Geschichte des Christenthums in der Periode seiner ersten Einführung in die Welt durch Jesum und die Apostel* (2 vols., 1818); *Ueber die Behandlung, die Haltbarkeit und den Werth des historischen Beweises für die Göttlichkeit des Christenthums* (1821); and *Geschichte der protestantischen Theologie von der Konkordienformel an bis in die Mitte des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts* (1831).

He was, throughout, judicial and conciliatory, refraining as much as possible from taking sides, and preferring painstaking investigation of facts to passing judgment.

Besides his historical works, Planck also wrote three quasi-romances, the first two anonymously: *Tagebuch eines neuen Ehemannes* (Leipsic, 1779);

Jonathan Ashley's Briefe (Bern, 1782); and the fragmentary *Das erste Amtsjahr des Pfarrers von S. in Auszügen aus seinem Tagebuch, eine Pastoraltheologie in Form einer Geschichte* (Göttingen, 1823).

(PAUL TSCHACKERT.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. S. Pütter, *Gelehrtengeschichte von der . . Universität zu Göttingen*, continued by Saalfeld and Oesterley, ii. 121, iii. 283 sqq., iv. 270, 4 parts, Göttingen, 1765–1838 (for list of works by and on Planck); G. C. F. Lücke, *Dr. G. J. Planck. Ein biographischer Versuch*, ib. 1835; *Nekrolog der Deutschen*, for 1833, ii. 581 sqq.; *ZHT*, 1836, i. 313 sqq. (by Mohnicke), 1843, iv. 75 sqq. (by E. Henke); G. Franck, *Geschichte der protestantischen Theologie*, iii. 359 sqq., Leipsic, 1875.

PLANCK, plānk, **HEINRICH LUDWIG:** German Lutheran; son of the preceding; b. at Göttingen July 19, 1785; d. there Sept. 23, 1831. He was educated at the university of his native city (1803–06), where he became lecturer in 1806. Four years later he was appointed associate professor of theology in the same institution, and in 1823 was promoted to a full professorship. He devoted himself particularly to New-Testament exegesis, and long labored on a lexicon of the Greek Testament, which he did not live to complete. Among his writings special mention should be made of the following: *Bemerkungen über I Timotheus* (Göttingen, 1808; in answer to Schleiermacher's attack on the authenticity of the epistle); *Entwurf einer neuen synoptischen Zusammenstellung der drei ersten Evangelien nach Grundsätzen der höherer Kritik* (1809); *De vera natura atque indole orationis Græcæ Novi Testamenti* (1810; Eng. transl. by A. S. Paterson, Edinburgh, 1833); and *Abriss der philosophischen Religionslehre* (Göttingen, 1821).

(PAUL TSCHACKERT.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Consult the literature under the preceding, especially G. C. F. Lücke, *Dr. G. J. Planck*, pp. 153 sqq., Göttingen, 1835; and the *Nekrolog* for 1831, ii. 303; also J. K. F. Schlegel, *Kirchen- und Reformationsgeschichte*, vol. iii., Hanover, 1832; G. Uhlhorn, *Hannoversche Kirchengeschichte*, Stuttgart, 1902; *ADB*, xxvi. 227; Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire*, fasc. xxxii., col. 457.

PLATH, plāt, **KARL HEINRICH CHRISTIAN:** Lutheran promoter of foreign missions; b. at Bamberg (69 m. n.e. of Posen) Sept. 8, 1829; d. at Berlin July 10, 1901. He was educated at Halle and Bonn (1849–53), and at Wittenberg Theological Seminary (1854–56); was preacher and religious instructor at Halle (1856–63); third secretary of the Society for Foreign Missions, Berlin (1863–71) and also instructor at the mission seminary, field-lecturer and author of missionary literature; first secretary of Gossner's Mission, after 1871; lecturer at the University of Berlin on missionary and religious history after 1867; and full professor after 1882. He visited India in 1877–78 on behalf of Gossner's Mission and twice afterward. He was author of *Leben des Freiherrn von Canstein* (Halle, 1861); *Sieben Zeugen des Herrn aus allerlei Volk* (Berlin, 1867); *Die Erwählung der Völker im Lichte der Missionsgeschichte* (1867); *Drei neue Missionsfragen* (1868; Eng. transl., *The Subject of Missions Considered under Three New Aspects*, Edinburgh, 1873); *Die Missionsgedanken des Freiherrn von Leibnitz* (1869); *Missions-Studien* (1870); and *Fünfzig Jahre Gossnerscher Mission* (1886).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: G. Plath, *Karl Plath, Inspektor der Gossnerschen Mission*, Schwerin, 1904.

PLATINA, BARTOLOMEO (BARTOLOMEO SACCHI): Italian humanist, theologian, and historian of the popes; b. at Piadena (17 m. e. of Cremona) 1421; d. at Rome 1481. After studying at Mantua, he went to Florence in 1457 to learn Greek of Argyropulos, and in 1462 migrated to Rome, where he obtained a position at the Curia in the College of Abbreviators. When Paul II. ascended the throne in 1464, Platina, like many others, lost his position, and then headed a sharp reaction against the pope. He was arrested and imprisoned for four months in the Castle of St. Angelo, and did not obtain a new office until Sixtus IV. appointed him director of the Vatican library, a position which he held until his death. The same pope gave him the incentive for the preparation of his most important work, his *Opus in vitas summorum pontificum ad Sixtum IV* (Venice, 1479; translated into the principal languages of Europe; Eng. transls., 2 vols., *Lives of the Popes*, London, 1685, 1888). In the main, Platina repeated the statements of his predecessors Damasus, Anastasius, Pandulphus, Ptolemæus of Lucca, and others, though he frequently made independent investigations. At the same time, like his precursors, he utilized forged decretals without suspecting their real nature.

In addition to Platina's *Opus*, mention should also be made of his *Historia inclytæ urbis Mantuæ et serenissimæ familiæ Gonzagæ libri sex* (Vienna, 1675).

K. BENRATH.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: On the editions, etc., of Platina's work on the popes consult Moller, *Dissertatio de B. Platina*, Altdorf, 1694, with which may be compared Tiraboschi, *Storia della Letteratura Italiana*, vol. vi., 11 vols., Modena, 1772–95; and *Historia inclytæ urbis Mantuæ*, ed. Lambecius, Vienna, 1675. Consult: Pastor, *Popes*, vols. ii.–iv. (use the Index); Creighton, *Papacy* (use the Index); S. Bissolati, *Le Vite di due illustri Cremonesi*, Milan, 1856; G. Voigt, *Die Wiederbelebung des klassischen Alterthums*, ii. 237 sqq., Berlin, 1881; J. Burckhardt, *Die Kultur der Renaissance*, ii. 277–278, Leipsic, 1898, Eng. transl., *The Civilization of the Renascence of Italy*, London, 1898.

PLATNER, plat'ner, **JOHN WINTHROP:** Congregationalist; b. at Lee, Mass., May 15, 1865. He was educated at Yale College (A.B., 1885), and after being a private tutor for five years entered Union Theological Seminary, from which he was graduated in 1893. He then studied at the University of Berlin for two years, after which he was an instructor at Union Theological Seminary for a year; he was assistant professor of ecclesiastical history at Harvard (1896–1901), and since 1901 has been professor of the same in Andover Theological Seminary.

PLATO. See PLATONISM AND CHRISTIANITY.

PLATO, plē'to, **PORPHORY ROJDESTVENSKI:** Archbishop of the Orthodox Russian Church in the United States; b. at Kursk (275 m. s. of Moscow), Russia, 1866. He became a priest in 1887 and a monk in 1894, and in 1902 was consecrated bishop of Chigizin, first auxiliary bishop of the archdiocese of Kief, and superior of the monastery of the Epiphany in Kief. He was a reactionary member of the second Duma, and in 1907 was elevated to the archbishopric of Aleutia and North America, with residence in New York City.

PLATON, plā'ton **(PETER LEVCHIN):** Metropolitan of Moscow; b. near Moscow June 29, 1737;

d. at Moscow 1812. He was the son of a psalmodist, and was educated at the seminary and the theological academy of Moscow. In 1757 he was appointed instructor in Greek and rhetoric at the latter institution, and became distinguished as a pulpit orator. Within the year he was called to be instructor in rhetoric at the famous monastery of the Holy Trinity near Moscow. Here he became a monk, adopting the name of Platon, and in 1761 was made rector of the seminary of the monastery. A sermon preached by him in Oct., 1762, produced so favorable an impression on the Empress Catherine II. that she summoned him to court to be the religious instructor of the eight-year-old heir apparent, Paul Petrovitch. Here he came into close contact with Voltaire and the encyclopedists, but without injury either to his faith or his character.

Platon remained at the Russian court, winning the admiration of even Voltaire, until the marriage of the heir apparent to Maria Feodorovna, daughter of Duke Eugene of Württemberg, in 1773. During this time he published, for the use of his royal pupil, his "Orthodox Doctrine: or, A short Compend of Christian Theology" (Moscow, 1765; Eng. transl., *The Present State of the Greek Church in Russia: or, A Summary of Christian Divinity*, by R. Pinkerton, Edinburgh, 1814), in which the influence of Western thought, and even of rationalism, may be distinctly traced. At the same time, Roman Catholic doctrines are mercilessly attacked, while the Lutheran tenet of ubiquity and the Reformed theory of predestination also receive their share of criticism. This catechism was followed, a year later, by the "Exhortation of the Orthodox Eastern Catholic Church of Christ to her former Children, now on the Road to Schism," pleading, though with scant success, for lenient treatment of dissenters from the Orthodox Church.

In 1768 Platon became a member of the synod, and in 1770 was made bishop of Tver, though he still remained at St. Petersburg, finally being the religious instructor of the new grand duchess. In 1775 he was enthroned archbishop of Moscow, and throughout the reigns of Catherine II., Paul, and Alexander I. diligently promoted the religious, moral, intellectual, and material welfare of his archdiocese, maintaining meanwhile an unceasing literary activity. In 1775 he issued a catechism for the use of the clergy, and in 1776 a short catechism for children, as well as one in the form of a dialogue, while his brief history of the Russian Church (1777) is the first systematic treatise of its kind in the Russian language.

In 1787 Platon reluctantly consented to become metropolitan of Moscow. He visited the city but seldom, however, passing the winter in the Triotzki monastery and the summer in the Pererva Monastery close to Moscow. Here he supervised personally the studies of the seminarians, who included three destined to succeed him as archbishop of Moscow. It was Platon who crowned both Paul (1797) and Alexander I. (1801); but despite his close and cordial relations with the court he preserved to the last his firmness and his independence. Shortly before his death he aided in preparing the way for the foundation of the Russian Bible society which was established in the year in which he died. The collected works of Platon were published at Moscow in twenty volumes in 1779–1807, the greater portion of these writings being sermons, of which there are about 500. An abridged English translation of Platon's catechism was prepared from a Greek version of the Russian original (London, 1867), and his sermon preached at the request of the empress to celebrate the victory of Tschesme also appeared in English (London, 1770). (H. Dalton.)

Bibliography: A life in Russian by Snegirew was published at Moscow, 1857, while incidents of the life, also in Russian, was by Barsow, ib. 1891. Consult: L. Boissard, *L'Église de Russie*, ii. 348 sqq., Paris, 1867; A. H. Hore, *Eighteen Centuries of the Orthodox Greek Church*, pp. 690–691, New York, 1899.

PLATONISM AND CHRISTIANITY.

Christian Estimate of Plato (§ 1).
Platonic Philosophy Spiritual (§ 2).
Platonic Philosophy Theistic (§ 3).
Platonic Philosophy Teleological and Ethical (§ 4).
Religion, Rewards, and Punishment in Plato (§ 5).
Merits and Defects (§ 6).
Later Platonic Schools (§ 7).

"The peculiarity of the Platonic philosophy," says Hegel, in his "History of Philosophy" (vol. ii.), "is precisely this direction toward the supersensuous world,—it seeks the elevation of consciousness into the realm of spirit. The Christian religion also has set up this high principle, that the internal spiritual essence of man is his true essence, and has made it the universal principle." Some of the early Fathers recognized a Christian element in Plato, and ascribed to him a kind of propædeutic office and relation toward Christianity. Clement of Alexandria calls philosophy "a sort of preliminary discipline for those who lived before the coming of Christ," and adds, "Perhaps we may say it was given to the Greeks with this special object; for philosophy was to the Greeks what the law was to the Jews,—a schoolmaster to bring them to Christ (cf. *Strom.*, I., v.–xx.; Eng. transl., *ANF*, ii. 305–324). "The Platonic dogmas," says Justin Martyr, "are not foreign to Christianity. If we Christians say that all things were created and ordered by God, we seem to enounce a doctrine of Plato; and, between our view of the being of God and his, the article appears to make the only difference" (cf. *II Apol.*, xiii.). "Justin" (says Ackermann, *Das Christliche im Plato*, chap. i., Hamburg, 1835; Eng. transl., *The Christian Element in Plato*, Edinburgh, 1861), "Justin was, as he himself relates, an enthusiastic admirer of Plato before he found in the Gospel that full satisfaction which he had sought earnestly, but in vain, in philosophy. And, though the Gospel stood infinitely higher in his view than the Platonic philosophy, yet he regarded the latter as a preliminary stage to the former. And in the same way did other apologetic writers express themselves concerning Plato and his philosophy, especially Athenagoras, the most spirited, and philosophically most important of them all, whose 'Apology' is one of the most admirable works of Christian antiquity." The Fathers of the early Church sought to explain the striking resemblance between the doctrines of Plato and those of

1. Christian Estimate of Plato.

Christianity, principally by the acquaintance, which, as they supposed, that philosopher had with learned Jews and with the Jewish Scriptures during his sojourn in Egypt, but partly, also, by the universal light of a divine revelation through the "Logos," which, in and through human reason, "lighteth every man that cometh into the world," and which illumined especially such sincere and humble seekers after truth as Socrates and Plato before the incarnation of the Eternal Word in the person of Jesus Christ. Passages which bear a striking resemblance to the Christian Scriptures in their picturesque, parabolic, and axiomatic style, and still more in the lofty moral, religious, and almost Christian sentiments which they express, are scattered thickly all through the dialogues, even those that treat of physical, political, and philosophical subjects; and they are as characteristic of Plato as is the inimitably graceful dialogue in which they are clothed. A good selection of such passages may be seen in the introductory chapters of Ackermann's work (ut sup.). A still more copious and striking collection might be made.

2. Platonic Philosophy Spiritual.

Perhaps the most obvious and striking feature of the Platonic philosophy is that it is preeminently spiritual. Hegel speaks of "this direction toward the supersensuous world," this "elevation of consciousness into the realm of spirit," as "the peculiarity of the Platonic philosophy." There is no doctrine on which Plato more frequently or more strenuously insists than this,—that soul is not only superior to body, but prior to it in order of time, and that not merely as it exists in the being of God, but in every order of existence. The soul of the world existed first, and then it was clothed with a material body. The souls which animate the sun, moon, and stars, existed before the bodies which they inhabit (*Timæus*). The preexistence of human souls is one of the arguments on which he relies to prove their immortality (*Phædo*, 73–76). Among the other arguments by which he demonstrates the immortality of the soul and its exalted dignity are these: that the soul leads and rules the body, and therein resembles the immortal gods (ib. 80); that the soul is capable of apprehending eternal and immutable ideas, and communing with things unseen and eternal, and so must partake of their nature (ib. 79); that, as consciousness is single and simple, so the soul itself is uncompounded, and hence incapable of dissolution (ib. 78); that soul, being everywhere the cause and source of life, and every way diametrically opposite to death, can not be conceived as dying, any more than fire can be conceived as becoming cold (ib. 102–107); that soul, being self-moved, and the source of all life and motion, can never cease to live and move (*Phædrus*, 245); that diseases of the body do not reach to the soul; and vice, which is a disease of the soul, corrupts its moral quality, but has no power or tendency to destroy its essence ("Republic," 610), etc. Spiritual entities are the only real existences: material things are perpetually changing, and flowing into and out of existence. God is: the world becomes, and passes away. The soul is: the body is ever changing, as a garment. Soul or ideas, which are spiritual entities, are the only true causes; God being the first cause why every thing is, and ideas being the secondary causes why things are such as they are (*Phædo*, 100–101). Mind and will are the real cause of all motion and action in the world, just as truly as of all human motion and action. According to the striking illustration in the *Phædo* (98, 99), the cause of Socrates awaiting death in the prison, instead of making his escape as his friends urged him to do, was that he chose to do so from a sense of duty; and, if he had chosen to run away, his bones and muscles would have been only the means or instruments of the flight of which his mind and will would have been the cause. And just so it is in all the phenomena of nature, in all the motions and changes of the material cosmos. And life in the highest sense, what we call spiritual and eternal life, all that deserves the name of life, is in and of and from the soul, which matter only contaminates and clouds, and the body only clogs and entombs (*Gorgias*, 492, 493). Platonism, as well as Christianity, says, Look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen; for the things which are seen are temporal, only for a season; but the things which are not seen are eternal (cf. II Cor. iv. 18).

3. Platonic Philosophy Theistic.

The philosophy of Plato is eminently theistic. "God," he says, in his "Republic" (716 A), "is (literally, holds) the beginning, middle, and end of all things. He is the supreme mind or reason, the efficient cause of all things, eternal, unchangeable, all-knowing, all-powerful, all-pervading, and all-controlling, just, holy, wise, and good, the absolutely perfect, the beginning of all truth, the fountain of all law and justice, the source of all order and beauty, and especially the cause of all good" (*Philebus*, *Phædo*, *Timæus*, "Republic," and "Laws," passim). God represents, he impersonates, he is the true, the beautiful, but, above all, the good. Just how Plato conceived these "ideas" to be related to the divine mind is disputed. In discussing the good, sometimes it is difficult to determine whether he means by it an idea, an attribute, a principle, a power, or a personal God. But he leaves no doubt as to his actual belief in the divine personality. God is the reason (the intelligence, *Phædo*, 97 C) and the good ("Republic," 508 C); but he is also the artificer, the maker, the Father, the supreme ruler, who begets, disposes, and orders all (cf. *Timæus*, with places just cited). He is *Theos* and *Ho Theos* (*Phædo*, 106 D, and often elsewhere). Plato often speaks also of gods in the plural; but to him, as to all the best minds of antiquity, the inferior deities are the children, the servants, the ministers, the angels, of the supreme God (*Timæus*, 41). Unity is an essential element of perfection. There is but one highest and best—the Most High, the Supreme Good, God in the true and proper sense is one. The Supreme God only is eternal, he only hath immortality in himself. The immortality of the inferior deities is derived, imparted to them by their Father and the Father of all, and is dependent on his will (*Timæus*, 41). God made the world by introducing order and beauty into chaotic matter, and putting into it a living, moving,

intelligent soul; then the inferior deities made man under his direction, and in substantially the same way. God made the world because he is good, and because, free from all envy or jealousy, he wished everything to be as much like himself as the creature can be like the creator (*Timæus*, 30 A). Therefore he made the world good; and when he saw it he was delighted (ib. 37 C; cf. Gen. i. 31). God is the author of all good, and of good only, not of evil. "Every good gift cometh down from the Father of the celestial luminaries"; "for it is morally impossible for the best being to do any thing else than the best" (*Timæus*, 30 A; cf. Jas. i. 17). God exercises a providential care over the world as a whole, and over every part (chiefly, however, through the inferior deities who thus fulfil the office of angels, "Laws," 905 B–906), and makes all things, the least as well as the greatest, work for good to the righteous and those who love God, and are loved by him (*Phædo*, 62; "Republic," 613). Atheism is a disease, and a corruption of the soul; and no man ever did an unrighteous act, or uttered an impious word, unless he was a theoretical or practical atheist ("Laws," 885 B), that is, in the language of the indictment at common law, he did it, "not having the fear of God before his eyes."

The Platonic philosophy is teleological. Final causes, together with rational and spiritual agencies, are the only causes that are worthy of the study of the philosopher: indeed, no others deserve the name (*Phædo*, 98 sqq.). If mind is the cause of all things, mind must dispose all things for the best; and when it is known how anything may best be made or disposed, then, and then only, is it known how it is and the cause of its being so (*Phædo*, 97).

4. Platonic Philosophy Teleological and Ethical.

Material causes are no causes; and inquiry into them is impertinent, unphilosophical, not to say impious and absurd. Thus did Plato build up a system of rational psychology, cosmology, and theology, all of which are largely teleological, on the twofold basis of a priori reasoning and mythology, in other words, of reason and tradition, including the idea of a primitive revelation. The eschatology of the *Phædo*, the *Gorgias*, and the "Republic," is professedly a *mythos*, though he insists that it is also a *logos* ("Republic," 523). His cosmology he professes to have heard from some one (*Phædo*, 108 D); and his theology in the *Timæus* purports to have been derived by tradition from the ancients, who were the offspring of the gods, and who must, of course, have known the truth about their own ancestors (40 C). Yet the whole structure is manifestly the work of his own reason and creative imagination; and the central doctrine of the whole is, that God made and governs the world with constant reference to the highest possible good; and "ideas" are the powers, or, in the phraseology of modern science, the "forces," by which the end was to be accomplished. The philosophy of Plato is preeminently ethical, and his ethics are remarkably Christian. Only one of his dialogues was classified by the ancients as "physical," and that (the *Timæus*) is largely theological. The political dialogues treat politics as a part of ethics,—ethics as applied to the State. Besides the four virtues as usually classified by Greek moralists,—viz., temperance, courage, justice, and wisdom,—Plato recognized as virtues humility and meekness, which the Greeks generally despised, and holiness, which they ignored (*Euthyphron*); and he teaches the duty of non-retaliation and non-resistance as strenuously, not to say paradoxically, as it is taught in the Sermon on the Mount (*Critias*, 49). That it is better to suffer wrong than to do wrong is a prominent doctrine of the *Gorgias* (479 E, 508 C). But as the highest "idea" is that of the good, so the highest excellence of which man is capable is likeness to God, the supreme and absolute good. A philosopher, who is Plato's ideal, is a lover of wisdom, of truth, of justice, of goodness ("Republic," book vi.), of God, and, by the contemplation and imitation of his virtues, becomes like him as far as it is possible for man to resemble God (ib. 613 A, B).

Plato is preeminently a religious philosopher. His ethics, his politics, and his physics are all based on his theology and his religion. Natural and moral obligations, social and civil duties, duties to parents and elders, to kindred and strangers, to neighbors and friends, are all religious duties ("Laws," ix. 881 A, xi. 931 A). Not only is God the lawgiver and ruler of the universe, but his law is the source and ground of all human law and justice. "That the gods not only exist, but that they are good, and honor and reward justice far more than men do, is the most beautiful and the best preamble to all laws" ("Laws," x. 887). Accordingly, in the "Republic" and the "Laws," the author often prefaces the most important sections of his legislation with some such preamble, exhortation, or, as Jowett calls it, sermon, setting forth the divine authority by which it is sanctioned and enforced. Plato gives prominence also to the doctrine of a future state of rewards and punishments. At death, by an inevitable law of its own being, as well as by the appointment of God, every soul goes to its own place; the evil gravitating to the evil, and the good rising to the supreme good. When they come before their judge, perhaps after a long series of transmigrations, each of which is the reward or punishment of the preceding, those who have lived virtuous and holy lives, and those who have not, are separated from each other. The wicked whose sins are curable are subjected to sufferings in the lower world, which are more or less severe, and more or less protracted, according to their deserts. The incurably wicked are hurled down to Tartarus, whence they never go out, where they are punished forever as a spectacle and warning to others (*Gorgias*, 523 sqq.; *Phædo*, 113 D). Those, on the other hand, who have lived virtuously and piously, especially those who have purified their hearts and lives by philosophy, will live without bodies (*Phædo*, 114 C), with the gods, and in places that are bright and beautiful beyond description.

5. Religion, Rewards, and Punishment in Plato.

Allusion only may be made to other characteristic features of Plato's philosophy, such, for example, as his doctrine of "ideas,"—the true, the beautiful, the good, the holy, and the like,—which,

looking at them now only on the ethical and practical side, are eternal and immutable, and not dependent even on the will of God (the holy, for instance, is not holy because it is the will of God, but it is the will of God because it is holy, just, and good—*Euthyphron*, 10 D); the indispensable necessity of a better than any existing, not to say better than human, society and government (like the ideal republic, which is not so much a state as a church or a school, a great family, or a man "writ large"), in order to the salvation of the individual or the perfection of the race; the degenerate, diseased, carnal, and corrupt state into which mankind in general has fallen since the reign of Kronos in the golden age ("Laws," 713 C; "Politics," 271 D; *Critias*, 108 D), and from which God only can save any individual or nation ("Republic," vi. 492, 493); and the need of a divine teacher, revealer, healer, charmer, to charm away the fear of death, and bring life and immortality to light (*Phædo*, 78 A, 859).

6. Merits and Defects.

But a passing glance may be given to the radical defects and imperfections of Plato's best teachings—his inadequate conception of the nature of sin as involuntary, the result of ignorance, a misfortune, and a disease in the soul, rather than a transgression of the divine law; his consequent erroneous ideas of its cure by successive transmigrations on earth, and protracted pains in purgatory, and by philosophy; his philosophy of the origin of evil, viz., in the refractory nature of matter, which must therefore be gotten rid of by bodily mortification, and by the death of the body without a resurrection, before the soul can arrive at its perfection; his utter inability to conceive of atonement, free forgiveness, regenerating grace, and salvation for the masses, a fortiori for the chief of sinners; the doubt and uncertainty of his best religious teachings, especially about the future life ("Apology," 40 E, 42; *Phædo*, 107 C); and the utter want in his system of the grace, even more than of the truth, that have come to us by Jesus Christ, for, after all, Platonism is not so deficient in the wisdom of God as it is in the power of God unto salvation. The "Republic," for example, proposes to overcome the selfishness of human nature by constitutions and laws and education, instead of a new heart and a new spirit, by community of goods and of wives, instead of loyalty and love to a divine-human person like Jesus Christ.

In the Middle and the New Academy, there was always more or less tendency to skepticism, growing out of the Platonic doctrine of the uncertainty of all human knowledge except that of "ideas."

7. Later Platonic Schools.

The Neo-Platonists (see NEO-PLATONISM), on the other hand, inclined toward dogmatism, mysticism, asceticism, theosophy, and even thaumaturgy, thus developing seeds of error that lay in the teaching of their master. After the Christian era, among those who were more or less the followers of Plato, were, at one extreme, the devout and believing Plutarch, the author of "Delay of the Deity in the Punishment of the Wicked," and the practical and sagacious Galen, whose work on the "Uses of the Parts of the Human Body" is an anticipation of the *Bridgewater Treatises*, both of whom, as also Socrates, would have accepted Christianity if they had come within the scope of its influence; and, at the other extreme, Porphyry and the Emperor Julian, who wielded the weapons of philosophy in direct hostility to the religion of Christ; while intermediate between them the major part of the philosophers of the Neo-Platonic and eclectic schools who came in contact with Christianity went on their way in indifference, neglect, or contempt of the religion of the crucified Nazarene. But not a few of the followers of Plato discovered a kindred and congenial element in the eminent spirituality of the Christian doctrines and the lofty ethics of the Christian life, and, coming in through the vestibule of the Academy, became some of the most illustrious of the Fathers and Doctors of the early Church. And many of the early Christians, in turn, found peculiar attractions in the doctrines of Plato, and employed them as weapons for the defense and extension of Christianity, or cast the truths of Christianity in a Platonic mold. The doctrines of the Logos and the Trinity received their shape from Greek Fathers, who, if not trained in the schools, were much influenced, directly or indirectly, by the Platonic philosophy, particularly in its Jewish-Alexandrian form. That errors and corruptions crept into the Church from this source can not be denied. But from the same source it derived no small additions, both to its numbers and its strength. Among the most illustrious of the Fathers who were more or less Platonic, may be named Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Theophilus, Irenæus, Hippolytus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Minutius Felix, Eusebius, Methodius, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa, and St. Augustine. Plato was the divine philosopher of the earlier Christian centuries; in the Middle Ages Aristotle succeeded to his place. But in every period of the history of the Church, some of the brightest ornaments of literature, philosophy, and religion—such men as Anselm, Erasmus, Melanchthon, Jeremy Taylor, Ralph Cudworth, Henry More, Neander, and Tayler Lewis—have been "Platonizing" Christians.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: No attempt can be made here to give a complete list of works on Plato, the works now cited being those which probably best illustrate the subject of the article. A notable bibliography, covering editions, translations, and critical treatises, is to be found in Baldwin, *Dictionary*, iii. 1, pp. 404–423, to be supplemented by the list entered under "Philosophy" in Fortescue's *Subject Index of Modern Works of the British Museum*, London, 1902 sqq. For the works of Plato the best eds. for general use are that on the basis of Stephens by C. D. Beck, 8 vols., Leipsic, 1893–99; and the ed. by J. Burnet, vols. i.–v., Oxford, 1900–07. The classical Eng. transl. is that of B. Jowett, *The Dialogues*, 3d ed., 5 vols., Oxford, 1892, with E. Abbott's *Index*, ib. 1895, *The Republic*, 2 vols., 3d ed., ib. 1908. Of prime importance are the works on the history of philosophy by Ueberweg, ed. M. Heinze, 9th ed., Berlin, 1901–05, Eng. transl. of the 4th ed., London, 1875–76; W. Windelband, 4th ed., Tübingen, 1907, Eng. transl. of 1st ed., New York, 1893; J. E. Erdmann, 2 vols., Berlin, 1895–96, Eng. transl., 3 vols., London, 1892–98; and E. Zeller, new ed., Tübingen, 1892, Eng. transl., London, 1897. Consult: G. C. B. Ackermann, *Das Christliche im Plato und in der platonischen Philosophie*, Eng. transl., *The Christian Element in Plato*, Edinburgh, 1860; F. Schleiermacher, *Introduction to Dialogues of Plato*, translated by W. Dobson, Cambridge and London, 1836; E. Zeller, *Platonischen Studien*, Tü-

bingen, 1839; J. F. Simon, *Études sur la theodicée de Platon et d'Aristote*, Paris, 1840; C. B. Smyth, *Christian Metaphysics, or Plato, Malebranche, and Gioberti Compared with the Modern Schools of Psychology*, London, 1851; C. Morgan, *An Investigation of the Trinity of Plato*, Cambridge, 1853; D. Becker, *Das philosophische System Platons in seiner Beziehung zum christlichen Dogma*, Leipsic, 1862; R. D. Hampton, *The Fathers of Greek Philosophy*, Edinburgh, 1862; G. Grote, *Plato and the Other Companions of Socrates*, London, 1865, 2d ed., 1867; B. F. Cocker, *Christianity and Greek Philosophy*, New York, 1870; A. E. Chaignet, *La Vie et les écrits de Platon*, Paris, 1871; J. W. Lake, *Plato, Philo and Paul*, Edinburgh, 1874; E. Zeller, *Plato and the Old Academy*, London, 1876; S. W. Mendenhall, *Plato and Paul, or Philosophy and Christianity*, Cincinnati, 1886; E. W. Simson, *Der Begriff der Seele bei Plato*, Leipsic, 1889; J. Lipperheide, *Thomas von Aquino und die platonische Ideenlehre*, Munich, 1890; J. H. Stirling, *Philosophy and Theology*, Edinburgh, 1890; C. Bénard, *Platon: sa vie et sa philosophie*, Paris, 1892; W Pater, *Plato and Platonism*, London and New York, 1893; J. W. G. van Oordt, *Plato and the Times he Lived in*, The Hague, 1895; H. Roeder, *Platons philosophische Entwickelung*, Leipsic, 1905; E. Reich, *Plato as an Introduction to Modern Criticism of Life*, London, 1906; C. Ritter, *Platon, sein Leben, seine Schriften, seine Lehre*, Munich, 1909; idem, *Neue Untersuchungen über Platon*, ib., 1910; A. E. Taylor, *Plato*, New York, 1909. Much that is illustrative from a historical point of view will be found in the literature under SCHOLASTICISM.

PLEASURE: An agreeable and gratifying feeling or desire which awakens in the person experiencing it a wish for its continuance or renewal. Neither the feeling nor the impulse is necessarily sinful, for desire and its gratification are essential to a complete life. Just as the man who takes pleasure in nothing is unhealthy, so one who seeks and desires nothing is in danger of becoming both mentally and morally a nonentity. Ethically, pleasure, both as feeling and desire, is determined by its relation to the ego, by the free personality of man, and by its object. Where, as in the ethics of Democritus, Epicurus, Protagoras, and others, the ego exalts its own natural sensations and desires into a norm of life, pleasure decides what is good and what is bad. On the other hand, the personality that has submitted itself to the divine will determines for itself what shall be pleasure and pain. It is divine revelation that guides man here, so that the Psalmist can say, " Delight thyself also in the Lord; and he shall give thee the desires of thine heart " (Ps. xxxvii. 4; cf. i. 2, lxxiii. 23–28, cxi. 2, cxii. 1, cxix.); and the New Testament makes communion with God the highest and most perfect pleasure of the Christian (cf. II Cor. v. 15; Gal. ii. 20; John xvii. 23). This pleasure, however, does not exclude the enjoyment of other pleasures. Pleasure in the true (science) and the beautiful (art), and even bodily pleasures in moderation, as in eating and in general comfort, are proper and consistent with the Christian life. Extreme asceticism is unchristian (I Tim. iv. 3–5; Col. ii. 16–23). Pleasure becomes sin only when the accompanying desire becomes lust, overpowers the will, and enslaves the personality. As a guard against this the moderate asceticism of Paul may be recommended (I Cor. ix. 27; Phil. iv. 11–13).

While desire is an essential element of human nature, it requires a curb. According to Roman Catholic doctrine, this was a special gift of grace bestowed upon Adam, without which man would be completely given up to sensuality. Desire in the first man was originally directed by God; but Adam renounced this guidance, and desire became concupiscence and lust, this depravity being transmitted by man's first parents to the entire human race. At times Paul uses " lust " as synonymous with " sin " (Rom. vii. 7); but in New-Testament usage the ethical character of desire, whether good or evil, depends upon the subject rather than upon the object (cf. John viii. 44; Rom. i. 24; Gal. v. 16; I John ii. 16). The duty of the Christian toward sinful natural impulses is set forth in Gal. v. 24 and Col. iii. 5.

The doctrinal difference between Roman Catholicism and Protestantism regarding original sin depends chiefly on their divergent interpretation of desire, the Council of Trent maintaining that, after the loss of the special gift of grace, man's nature was weakened, though neither the loss of his original righteousness nor the desire which remains even in the regenerate is necessarily sinful. Protestantism, on the contrary, holds that desire is evil in itself. (KARL BURGER.)

PLENARY (*Liber plenarius*): The term applied in the early Middle Ages to a missal containing all the liturgy appertaining to the mass, thus combining what was usually scattered through the sacramentary, gradual, and lectionary. Though such plenaries existed in the ninth century, the extant manuscript copies are not older than the eleventh. Later in the Middle Ages the plenaries were translated into German with various additions explanatory of the mass. The name was likewise applied to lectionaries containing the epistles and Gospels for Sundays and feasts, with glosses or postils on the Gospels; and the plenaries came to be called simply Gospel books or postils. With the Reformation the plenary vanished, none being known to have been issued after 1521. (P. DREWS.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. Alzog, in *Freiburger Diöcesan-Archiv*, viii (1874), 255 sqq.; M. F. A. G. Campbell, *Annales de la typographie néerlandaise au 15. siècle*, The Hague, 1874; F. Falk, *Die Druckkunst im Dienste der Kirche*, pp. 29 sqq., Cologne, 1879; R. Cruel, *Geschichte der deutschen Predigt im Mittelalter*, pp. 533 sqq., Detmar, 1879.

PLITT, GUSTAV LEOPOLD: German Lutheran; b. at Genin, near Lübeck, Mar. 27, 1836; d. at Erlangen Sept. 10, 1880. He studied theology at the universities of Erlangen (1854–56, 1857–58) and Berlin (1856–57), and early in 1861 became privat-docent at the former institution, lecturing chiefly on church history and especially on the Reformation period and the life of Luther, and also on exegesis. At the same time he developed his literary activity, publishing *Melanchthons Loci communes in ihrer Urgestalt* (Erlangen, 1864) and soon after his main work, *Einleitung in die Augustana* (2 vols., 1867–68). In 1867 Plitt was appointed associate professor. Besides continuing his work as an author, evidenced in his *Aus Schelling's Leben, in Briefen* (3 vols., Leipsic, 1869–70) and *Kurze Geschichte der lutherischen Mission, in Vorträgen* (Erlangen, 1871), he took an active part as preacher at the university and in influencing practical church life.

In 1867 he became the head of the Bavarian

Verein für Judenmission, and was equally energetic in behalf of home missions and philanthropic enterprises, being also one of the founders of the institution of army deacons in the Franco-Prussian war. In 1875 he was advanced to a full professorship, and in the same year published his *Grundriss der Symbolik für Vorlesungen* (Erlangen, 1875), which had been preceded by *Die Apologie der Augustana, geschichtlich erklärt* (1873). Meanwhile he had continued his studies on the period of the Reformation, and contemplated combining them into a biography of Luther which should appeal to the cultured public as well as to scholars. This work, begun by him, was completed after his death by his friend E. F Petersen of Lübeck, appearing under the title, *Martin Luthers Leben und Wirken* (Leipsic, 1883). In 1877 he became associated with Johann Jakob Herzog (q.v.) in the preparation of the second edition of the *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, a task for which wide theological knowledge, unwearying energy, and breadth of view rendered him peculiarly adapted. He had been able, however, to help to finish only half the work when he died. (F. Frank†.)

PLOCKHOY, PIETER CORNELISZ: "The father of modern socialism"; born at Zierikzee (35 m. n.w. of Antwerp) about 1600; d. in Germantown, Pa., about 1674. Becoming interested in plans for the realization of the Christian ideal through the best social and industrial methods, he crossed to England and had two interviews with Cromwell, who was greatly interested in his project. On the decease of the protector, Sept. 3, 1658, Plockhoy discussed his scheme with parliament, but owing to the breakdown of government in England was not able to secure cooperation. He printed in English at London in 1659 a pamphlet of fourteen pages, with an advertisement or an invitation of the same bulk, setting forth *A Way Propounded to make the Poor in these and other Nations happy by bringing together a fit, suitable and well qualified People into one Household Government or little Commonwealth, wherein Everyone may keep his own Property and be employed in some Work or other, as he shall see fit, without being oppressed.*"

He proposed to assemble in a common lot and housing four sorts of people: husbandmen, handicraftsmen, mariners, and masters of arts and sciences, who were to be industrial, yet cultivated and of good character, that is, "only rational and impartial persons." "All intractable persons, such as those in communion with the Roman see, usurious Jews, English stiff-necked Quakers; Puritans; fool-hardy believers in the Millennium; and obstinate modern pretenders to revelation," were to be excluded. Those not of the elect or limited number could join the community as servants or assistants. Two houses were deemed necessary, one for the living occupants and one for a warehouse, factory, and shops. Rents were to be cheap and there was to be no overcharging. In the living-house, the sexes were to sit on opposite sides of the table, and dwell in mutual courtesy, using no titles. They were to acknowledge none but Christ as head and master. A president was to be elected annually to be the executive, but he was to have no salary or remuneration. In the large hall at the religious and devotional exercises, which included singing and Bible-reading, each was to take turns in speaking, and each was to make his discourses short. Then the business of the court began. No clergyman or capitalist was allowed. One hundred families were to be associated, so that, for example, instead of the work of one hundred women toiling as in separate families, only twenty-five could do the housework, while seventy-five were set free for other productive labors. In like manner, instead of 100 fires, four or five furnaces could heat the whole habitation. Each was to work six hours a day for the benefit of the colony, the rest of the time could be devoted to private interests. The profits were to be divided equally among all over twenty years and to others in proportion.

After the fall of the Netherlands West India Company the city of Amsterdam financed Plockhoy's project after a contract of 117 articles had been made, giving 100 guilders to each colonist twenty-four years old and free from debt. Colonists were to be ready by Sept. 15, 1662. The settlement was made on Hoorn Kill on the Delaware River, near Swannendaal (New Castle). It seems to have flourished until 1664, at the conquest of New Netherland by the English. Then Sir Robert Carr seized and plundered the Delaware settlements, sold the Dutch soldiers as slaves in Virginia, stripped the colonists bare, and took "what belonged to the Quaking Society of Plockhoy, to a very naile." It is not known what became of his colonists, but ten years later Plockhoy, now blind and his wife leading him, came into Germantown, Pa., where the couple were given a house during the ten years of his remaining life. Some of Plockhoy's ideas, once novel, are now commonplace. His pamphlet in Dutch, *Kort en klaer ontwerp door een Volckplanting aan de Zuytrevier in Nieuw Nederland* (16 pages, Amsterdam, 1662), is described and discussed by E. B. O'Callaghan, *History of New Netherland; or, New York under the Dutch*, ii. 461–469, New York, 1848; J. R. Brodhead, *Hist. of the State of New York*, i. 697–699, ib. 1853; G. M. Asher, *Bibliographical and Historical Essay on the Dutch Books and Pamphlets Relating to New Netherlands*, pp. 205–208, 2 parts, Amsterdam, 1854–67; W. E. Griffis, *The Story of New Netherland*, pp. 131, 138, Boston, 1909. W E. Griffis.

PLOTINUS. See Neoplatonism, II.

PLUMER, WILLIAM SWAN: Presbyterian; b. at Greersburg (now Darlington), Beaver Co., Pa., July 26, 1802; d. at Baltimore, Md., Oct. 22, 1880. He was educated at Washington College, Lexington, Va., where he graduated in 1825; and at Princeton Theological Seminary in 1826; and was ordained in 1827

After working in various fields he was pastor at Petersburg, Va. (1831–34), Richmond (1835–46), Baltimore (1847–54), and at Allegheny, Pa. (1855–1862), where he served at the same time as professor of didactic and pastoral theology in the Western Theological Seminary. He supplied the pulpit of Arch Street Church, Philadelphia (1862–65);

was pastor at Pottsville, Pa. (1865–66); and professor in the theological seminary at Columbia, S. C. (1867–80). He possessed a singular impressiveness in the pulpit and a gift for teaching. His writings are practical and didactic and of an ultra-Calvinistic cast. He founded *The Watchman of the South* in 1837 and was sole editor, 1837–45. Some of his works are *The Bible True and Infidelity Wicked* (New York, 1848); *The Saint and the Sinner* (Philadelphia, 1851); *The Grace of Christ* (1853); *The Law of God as Contained in the Ten Commandments* (1864); *Sermons for the People* (1871); and Commentaries on Romans (1870), and on Hebrews (1872).

PLUMMER, ALFRED: Church of England; b. at Heworth (near Gateshead, opposite Newcastle-on-Tyne), Durhamshire, Feb. 17, 1841. He was educated at Exeter College, Oxford (B.A., 1863; M.A., 1866), and was ordered deacon in 1866, but has never been ordained to the priesthood. He was fellow of Trinity College (1865–75), and was tutor and dean of the same college (1867–74); he was master of University College, Durham (1874–1902), where he was junior proctor of the University of Durham (1875–77), senior proctor (1877–93), and subwarden (1896–1902). He was one of the last pupils of J. J. I. von Döllinger, and translated that theologian's *Fables respecting the Popes of the Middle Ages* (London, 1871); *Prophecies and the Prophetic Spirit in the Christian Era* (1873); and *Hippolytus and Callistus: or, The Church of Rome in the first Half of the third Century* (Edinburgh, 1876). He has prepared Peter and Jude for *The New Testament Commentary for English Readers* (London, 1879); the Johannine Gospel and Epistles for *The Cambridge Bible for Schools* (Cambridge, 2 vols., 1880, 1882) and for *The Cambridge Greek Testament* (2 vols., 1882, 1886), and II Corinthians for the same series (2 vols., 1903); The Pastoral Epistles, James, and Jude for *The Expositor's Bible* (2 vols., London, 1888, 1890); Luke for *The International Commentary* (Edinburgh, 1896); and an independent commentary on Matthew (1909). He has also written the historical introduction to Joshua, Nehemiah, and the Johannine Epistles in *The Pulpit Commentary* (2 vols., London, 1881, 1889), and is the author of *The Church of the Early Fathers* (London, 1887); *English Church History from the Death of Henry VII. to the Death of William III.* (3 vols., Edinburgh, 1904–07); and *The Church of England in the Eighteenth Century* (1910).

PLUMPTRE, EDWARD HAYES: Church of England; b. at London Aug. 6, 1821; d. at Wells Feb. 1, 1891. He was scholar of University College, Oxford (B.A., 1844; M.A., 1847); and fellow of Brasenose College (1844–47); assistant preacher at Lincoln's Inn (1851–58); select preacher at Oxford (1851–53, 1864–66, 1872–73); chaplain of King's College, London (1847–68); professor of pastoral theology there (1853–63); dean of Queen's College, London (1855–75); prebendary of Portpool, in St. Paul's Cathedral (1863–81); professor of exegesis in King's College, London (1863–81); examining chaplain to the bishop of Gloucester and Bristol (1865–67); Boyle lecturer (1866–67); rector of Pluckley, Kent (1869–73); Grinfield lecturer on the Septuagint at Oxford (1872–74); examiner in school of theology at Oxford (1872–73); vicar of Bickley, Kent (1873–81); principal of Queen's College, London (1875–77); and examining chaplain to the late archbishop of Canterbury (1879–82). On Dec. 21, 1881, he was installed dean of Wells. He was a member of the Old-Testament company of revisers, 1870–74, and is known also as a hymnist. For *The Bible* ("Speaker's") *Commentary* he wrote the comments on The Book of Proverbs (1873); for C. J. Ellicott's *New-Testament Commentary for English Readers*, those on the first three Gospels, the Acts, and II Corinthians (1877); for the *Old-Testament Commentary* by the same general editor, those on Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Lamentations (1882–84); for *The Cambridge Bible*, those on Ecclesiastes, James, Peter, and Jude; and for Philip Schaff's *Popular Commentary on the New Testament*, those on I Timothy and II Timothy (1883). He edited *The Bible Educator* (4 vols., London and New York, 1874). He likewise published *The Calling of a Medical Student*, four sermons (1849); *The Study of Theology and the Ministry of Souls* (1853); *King's College Sermons* (1859); *Sophocles* (a translation; 1865); *Æschylus* (a translation; 1868); *St. Paul in Asia Minor and the Syrian Antioch* (1877); *The Epistles to the Seven Churches* (1877); *Biblical Studies* (1870; 4th ed., 1884); *Introduction to the New Testament* (1883); *Things New and Old* (1884); *Theology and Life*, sermons (1866); *Spirits in Prison, and other Studies on Life after Death* (1884); *Life and Letters of Thomas Ken, Bishop of Bath and Wells* (2 vols., 1888); *Lazarus and Other Poems* (1864); *Master and Scholar* (poems; 1866); *Christ and Christendom* (Boyle Lectures; 1867; new ed., 1899); *The Commedia and Canzoniere of Dante Alighieri* (new translation, with notes, life, and portraits, 2 vols., 1887); and *Wells Cathedral and its Deans* (1888). The two hymns by him which are most widely known are "Rejoice, ye pure in heart," and "Thine arm, O Lord, in days of old."

Bibliography: Julian, *Hymnology*, p. 897; S. W. Duffield, *English Hymns*, pp. 208–209, New York, 1886; *DNB*, xlv. 437–438.

PLUNKET, WILLIAM CONYNGHAM: Church of Ireland archbishop; b. at Dublin, Ireland, Aug. 26, 1828; d. there Apr. 1, 1897 Graduated at Trinity College, Dublin (B.A., 1853; M.A., 1864); was ordained deacon (1857), and priest (1858); was rector of Kilmoylan and Cummer, Tuam (1858–64); chaplain and private secretary to the bishop of Tuam, and treasurer of St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin (1864–67); precentor of St. Patrick's (1869–1877); consecrated lord bishop of Meath (1876); and translated to the joint archbishopric of Dublin, Glendalough, and Kildare, in 1884. He was a leader of the Evangelical party in the Irish Church; strenuously opposed its disestablishment prior to 1868; fostered a sympathy for struggling Protestant communities, and took an active part in the Protestant movements in Spain and Italy; reorganized what is now the Church of Ireland Training College (Kildare Place); and for his activity in educational matters was nominated in 1895 a member of the

board of national education. In 1871 he succeeded his father in the peerage.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: F. D. How, *William Conyngham Plunket, . . , a Memoir*, London, 1900; *DNB*, Supplement, iii. 275–277.

PLURALITIES: A term in canon law for the holding, by a clergyman, of two or more livings at the same time. The canon law forbids it; but Roman Catholic bishops granted dispensations to commit the offense until by the general council of 1273 the right was taken from them. The popes still exercise this right. In England the power to grant dispensations to hold two benefices with the care of souls is vested in the monarch and in the archbishop of Canterbury. The benefices thus held must not be farther apart than three miles, and the annual value of one of them must be under a hundred pounds.

PLUTARCH OF ATHENS. See NEOPLATONISM, III., § 3.

PLUVIAL. See VESTMENTS AND INSIGNIA, ECCLESIASTICAL.

PLYMOUTH BRETHREN.

I. History.
Foundation; Record till 1845 (§ 1).
The Newton Episode (§ 2).
Defection of Cronin and Kelly (§ 3).
Further Divisions (§ 4).
Present Status (§ 5).
II. Doctrines.

I. History: The Plymouth Brethren, called by others Darbyites or Exclusive Brethren, and by themselves "Brethren," are to be distinguished from Bible Christians and Disciples of Christ (qq.v.). They took their origin in Ireland about 1828 after a movement under the leadership of John Walker which was a revolt against ministerial ordination, and in England the origin is connected with the interest in prophecy stimulated by Edward Irving (q.v.). Conferences like those under the Irving movement were held from 1828 at Powerscourt Mansion, County Wicklow, Ireland, at which John Nelson Darby (q.v.) was a prominent figure. Prior to this, from 1826 private meetings had been held on Sundays under the leadership of Edward Cronin, who had been a Roman Catholic and later a Congregationalist, for "breaking bread," at which Anthony Norris Groves, John Vesey Parnell (second Lord Congleton), and John Gifford Bellett, a friend of Darby, were attendants. In 1827 John Darby resigned his charge and in 1828 adopted the non-conformist attitude of the men named above, prompted by the Erastianism of a petition of Archbishop Magee to the House of Commons, and issued a paper on *The Nature and Unity of the Church of Christ* (in vol. i. of his *Collected Writings*, London, 1867). This served to swell the ranks of the Brethren, so that in 1830 a public "assembly" was started in Aungier Street, Dublin, which emphasized "the coming of the Lord as the present hope of the Church and the presence of the Holy Ghost as that which brought into unity" and "the heavenly character of the Church," and used as the golden text Matt. xviii. 20. Through Francis William Newman (q.v.), Darby had become acquainted with Benjamin Wills Newton (a lay fellow of Exeter College) and George Vicesimus Wigram at Oxford. He also visited Plymouth (whence the name for the Brethren), where Robert Hawker had been active in Evangelical ministry, and held meetings there, the outcome of which was the first English gathering of the Brethren (1831). The basis of communion was the acceptance of "all that are on the foundation" and rejection of "all error by the Word of God and the help of his ever present Spirit," recognizing that "degeneracy claimed service, and not departure." Before the appearance of Darby's *Liberty of Preaching and Teaching* (1834), the Brethren had taken their stand upon a free ministry, while other weighty papers by Darby and Newton appeared in the new magazine, *The Christian Witness*, edited by J. L. Harris. Recruits of note were Henry Craik and Georg (Friedrich) Müller (q.v.), coming from the Baptist denomination. The latter had been in the service of the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews, but became convinced that assemblies should consist only of the converted and joined the Brethren, beginning pastoral work at Bristol in 1832 on the lines of their policy, and developing the other activities for which he became famous. Other noted converts to the denomination were Samuel Prideaux Tregelles (q.v.) and Robert Chapman. Darby continued his work in London, then went to the continent, where in French Switzerland he promoted the movement by personal and literary activities, opposing a regular ministry as ignoring the privilege of every believer to direct access to God. While there he became aware of a tendency toward isolation manifesting itself in Newton, shown in his revival of restricted ministry together with doctrinal divergencies, e.g., Newton's adherence to the Reformation teaching of justification, inclusion of the Old-Testament saints in the apocalyptic Church, and belief that the second advent would not precede the "great tribulation," to which the Church would be subject. Failing to secure satisfaction from Newton and his adherents, in 1845 Darby started a separate assembly.

1. Foundation; Record till 1845.

Newton remained at Plymouth for two years. The dispute so far had concerned the special "testimony" of Brethren as such. According to notes of a lecture by Newton acquired by Harris in 1847, Newton's position as to our Lord's person was unsound: Christ by his incarnation and as a descendant of Adam entered upon a relation of distance from God, and as an Israelite incurred from birth the condemnation attaching to the broken law. Tregelles shows that the personal sinlessness was maintained through the seal at Christ's baptism, although lifelong suffering was entailed by his relationship. Newton withdrew the first part of his statement, but did not satisfy Darby, and a definite alienation separated the two men. Newton severed his connection with the Brethren, but continued till his death (1898) to write on prophetical subjects. Tregelles is reported by Scrivener to have died in the communion of the Church of England. In 1848 the Bristol company did not refuse fellowship to the adherents of Newton, and one of

2. The Newton Episode.

their number, George Alexander, seceded on the ground that "blasphemers were sheltered," taking occasion for this action in a paper intended to apply to the special circumstances but construed as a statement of a general policy. After debate and several assemblies, it was decided that no one upholding Newton s views should be received into communion, and several to whom this applied withdrew, though it appeared that they were afterward readmitted. Darby insisted upon the fundamental of "separation from evil" as "God's principle of unity"; the result was a breach between him and the Bristol company, his followers insisting upon his statement as the watchword, while the opponents' formula was "the blood of the Lamb is the union of saints." Wigram charged Craik with statements concerning Christ's physical ailments which savored of Newtonianism; but Darby sent a farewell message to Craik on his deathbed (1866), which did not, however, heal the breach. A new magazine, *The Present Testimony*, edited by Wigram, became the organ of the exclusives, followed in 1856 by the monthly *Bible Treasury*, for which William Kelly (q.v.) was responsible, and to this also Darby contributed papers on the sufferings of Christ, in which he argued that Christ endured certain non-atoning sufferings, in addition to those borne vicariously in death, due to his voluntary position in Israel (John xi. 51), in fulfilment of prediction of his participation in the sorrows of the godly remnant in the last days. This had no affiliation with the Newtonian doctrine, which affected the whole life of Christ; but some of his followers, unable to distinguish between Darby's position and Newton's, withdrew from fellowship with him. Darby offered to abstain from ministry, but was counseled not to do so by his prominent supporters. Meanwhile he had worked on German soil, where he had met Tholuck, and had visited the United States, Canada, and other British colonies lecturing and writing.

In 1879 a gathering at Ryde, Isle of Wight, failed to deal with depravity in the midst, and Darby's old Dublin associate Cronin, desiring to end the scandal, founded a new "assembly" in the place.

3. Defection of Cronin and Kelly.

Darby regarded this as a breach of unity, and called upon Cronin's home congregation at Kensington, London, to discipline the offender, and to "judge" his "indiscretion." Cronin was defended by use of Darby's avowal that the old assembly was "rotten" and that for thirty years he himself had avoided it. A crusade was nevertheless directed against Cronin by the leaders at Park Street, Islington, and additional matters connected with baptism entered into the controversy. Finally, although Darby had asked only for a stern rebuke, Cronin's stubbornness widened the breach and he was excommunicated. About the same time there was disruption at Ramsgate, Kent, one of the rival parties at which supported Cronin while the other strongly condemned him, the assemblies at Blackheath, where Kelly resided, and at Islington also taking opposite sides. The result was a split in 1881 at Park Street like that which had occurred in the Bethesda affair. Each side charged the other with "independency," and Darby described the situation as a struggle between intelligence and the Spirit, by "intelligence" referring to Kelly's endeavor to give intellectual expression to the policy hitherto pursued and thereby to maintain the "unity of London." The man who had so long led meditated withdrawing altogether from the Brethren, feeling that the encroachments of the world had marred "the testimony"; but his faith reasserted itself. Darby's survival of this poignant situation can be counted only by months, as he died the next year. He was little disposed to learn from others, and claimed to have "the mind of the Spirit." He united Roman Catholic with Evangelical ideas, though his own apprehension of Scripture dominated his mind. He regarded himself as the beginning of the Plymouth Brethren, which was true at least so far as the English branch was concerned. Where he was iconoclastic, it was not, as he expressed it, "with an Edomitic attack but with Jeremianic sorrow."

The year 1885 was notable for concurrent divisions among Darby's last associates on both sides of the Atlantic. In the United States Frederick William Grant, of Plainfield, N. J., alienated rivals in the Islington party by his candidly independent attitude toward some of their cherished doctrines.

Further Divisions.

He was an ex-clergyman of Canadian origin, a man of much erudition, and highly esteemed in his section. He held that the saints of the old dispensation possessed eternal life, and agreed with the interpretation of Rom. vii. which holds that the apostle there describes the moral condition of believers even after receiving the seal of the Spirit. The English leaders detached their adherents from fellowship with him. At Reading, England, Clarence Esme Stuart, an accomplished Biblical scholar who had sided with Darby in 1881, came into collision with James Butler Stoney, an unbalanced teacher who was no longer held by the restraint imposed by Darby's presence. Stuart's primal offense was that at Reading he had not adopted the hymn-book last revised by Darby; second, that he unduly distinguished between the standing and state (or condition) of believers, holding that the Pauline expression "in Christ" sets forth condition alone, and that in this are to be sought such distinctions as obtain fundamentally between believers of the different dispensations. With these doctrinal issues was combined a social breach between him and a local female ally of the Stoney school. Upon this last matter the Reading assembly refused to give judgment, though with some dissent against the order of procedure, supported by the Stoney faction dominant in London, which separated from Reading and carried many assemblies with them. Those in Great Britain who disowned the interference of the London adherents continued to recognize the Grant contingent in America. Stuart gave color to the new departure by shortly afterward emphasizing his view of atonement, according to which Christ, as high priest only after death, made propitiation by blood not on the cross but in heaven, in the interval between death and resurrection. This view was not unknown in theology (e.g., Professor George Smeaton), but was regarded by Stuart's critics as a

novel inference from Darby's teaching. The year 1890 witnessed a further division among the "exclusives" of the party formed in 1885. Frederick Edward Raven of Greenwich became prominent through teaching doctrines which were reprobated by the old Darbyites. He questioned the claim of believers in general to have had eternal life imparted to them, in doing so seeming, as an Apollinarian, to impair the glory of Christ's person. He held also that Scripture is not as such the word of God but the record of it, to which resort is to be had for confirmation of oral ministry. Reconciliation he regarded, with Calvin, as a continuous process which believers undergo. In the division which ensued a majority of Stoney's associates and a small band in the United States stood with Raven, but the continent of Europe was lost to them. From 1881 to his death in 1906 Kelly continued to be revered as a sound teacher of the first order, possessed of great capacity as a leader and controversialist. He was unremitting in his ministry and in writing, defending the truth as he conceived it against all innovation, in particular against the higher criticism. With him passed away the last survivor of the golden age of the Brethren.

5. Present Status.

This community has, then, resolved itself into the following sectional fellowships. (1) Brethren fully recognizing the existing congregation at Bethesda (Bristol) and regarding, with Westcott, the primitive unity of the Church as that of a federation; adhering to Baptist views; open in communion; and existing in Great Britain and the colonies, Europe, North and South America, India, and China. It has the largest following. (2) Those who followed Darby more or less closely, in five branches. (a) Brethren chiefly in France, Switzerland, and Germany, with a remnant in England and the United States, committed to Darby's ecclesiastical position as defined since 1881. (b) Associates of Kelly, adhering to Darby's doctrinal views, with the exception of pedobaptism, and to the system prevalent in 1848–81; mainly in England. (c) Associates of Stuart and Grant, loath to abandon anti-Bethesda discipline, but standing for elasticity in doctrine. (d) Associates of Raven, opposed to Bethesda, favoring expansion of doctrine of their own type, but including some independent of this; in Great Britain, the colonies, and the United States. These have since 1908 composed two sections, separated from one another by disciplinary policy and views of evangelization and redemption. On the other hand, there has been for several years a movement, originating in America, for abatement of the alienation between the various types of bodies. Some adherents of Grant have lowered the barriers between themselves and "open" Brethren, while not giving themselves this name; and since 1906 a corresponding movement has gathered force in Great Britain. These "eclectics" repudiate the distinction between "open" and "close," and seek, by a blending of the Pauline and Johannine aspects of the Church, to revive the unity first realized at Dublin untrammeled by formal federation of either open or close types, which is favored by neither element. A hopeful feature of the situation is the absence of a pronounced leadership. No denominational statistics exist for Great Britain. In the United States there are over 300 assemblies with about 7,000 communicants. The denomination has drawn its membership from all ranks of society—the nobility, the army and navy, the judiciary, and scholars in various spheres. It has had notable Evangelists like Charles Stanley and Denham Smith; missionaries like Baedeker and Arnot have propagated its teachings in the world field; while C. H. Mackintosh is the writer whose works are most widely used.

II. Doctrines: A full epitome of the doctrine developed among the Brethren could be obtained only from the writings of Darby, who was the chief teacher. So large was his authority in his denomination that for most Athanasius, Augustine, Luther, and Calvin were mere ciphers. On the Godhead and the person of Christ the teaching is that common to Catholic Christianity. On human nature it is held that Adam was first sinless, not virtuous or holy; the fall spelled unqualified ruin. The atonement has two sides: Godward it is propitiation; manward, substitution; the purchase of all, the redemption of the believer, and Christ's death under wrath. Predestination is held as the election of individuals, the assured acceptance of believers, together with denial of free will and reprobation. Justification implies the righteousness of God (not of Christ specifically) displayed in the resurrection of the Savior, with dissociation of his life from the process. Sanctification is positive and practical; in the latter aspect it involves self-judgment and confession to God, insuring a sense of forgiveness through Christ's priesthood, which preserves from sin, as his advocacy restores. Cleansing by his blood is once for all, cleansing by the Word continues. Not the law, but the Second Man's risen life is the believer's rule. The Church was primitively one visible, closely organized community. The "assembly," in view of grace, is the body of Christ; in view of government is the house of God; one is the product of the Spirit, the other is the product of man, marked by failure and ruin. National churches are too broad, non-conformity is too narrow. Darby denies what has been suggested by critics—that the "gathering" is held to be coextensive with "the Church of God on earth"; he also repudiates the further assertion that for eighteen centuries there has been no church. The ordinances are (1) baptism, which is required for fellowship. Among the exclusives mutual toleration is practised by baptists and pedobaptists. Darby's view was based on the recognition of privileged position (outward as distinct from inward, essential baptism). Other pedobaptists practise household baptism. (2) The Lord's Supper is observed weekly in the forenoon, at which leavened bread and fermented wine are taken by the members seated. The institution is commemorative only. Participation in this is jealously guarded; in theory it is the privilege of all believers, but in practise the theory is overborne by the notion of full fellowship. The special means of grace are the Holy Scriptures according to the canon of the Reformers. The book is infallible; consequently the idea is condemned that the Church and the Bible stand or fall to-

gether. The higher criticism is not recognized; development is disowned, and the truth is recovered by reversion to St. Paul (not, as the Quakers hold, to the "historical Christ"). Since Darby's dying recommendation not to neglect the Johannine doctrine, the center of gravity is increasingly sought in that. The Bible version favored is Darby's own (in English, French, and German); he rejected the Revised Version with the words, "They have not had the mind of God at all." In the matter of the ministry Darby did not begin by questioning the validity of Anglican orders. His conception of the office was service in the Word, the faithful exercise of a special gift, for which the individual is responsible to the Lord alone. A distinction is made between "gift" and "office"; the latter came through apostolic appointment and is no longer available. The "assembly," while not being the source of the ministry, since it is the taught and not the teacher, may or may not accredit the ministry as profitable. Anything beyond the moral influence of the Spirit is regarded as delusion. In theory, all godly men are possibly competent, whether in formal fellowship or not; but in practise such fellowship is presupposed, and the flock is discouraged from "wandering." The public ministry of women is disallowed. Worship is conducted, as among the Quakers, by "waiting on the Lord," and conventional collections of hymns are used in praise and prayer. The Lord's Prayer is discarded, as symbolic of the position and desires of the inchoate Church and typical of the Jewish remnant. The local assembly acts through non-official organs, men of moral weight whose personal influence is encouraged as commanding confidence. As discipline excommunication is practised for grave delinquency and for lapse into fundamental error in doctrine. With the exclusives I Cor. v. 6; II Tim. ii. 19 sqq.; and II John 10 have furnished the rule of action. While this has been the object of criticism, in practise its influence has been salutary, restraining tendencies to antinomianism. For eschatology, it is held that believers at death go not to Hades but to a heavenly paradise with Christ. Within the present dispensation Christ will at an initial coming gather all his people to his tribunal for reward according to conduct, and will subsequently visit the earth in an appearance for judgment of living nations (Newton denied the distinction between the two and the interval). The second beast of Rev. xiii. is regarded as the Antichrist. No Christian will pass through the great tribulation (Newton expected that Christ will be revealed before the parousia), while the Church with Christ will reign over the earth for a millennium, with Israel, the earthly bride, as administrative assessor. The final judgment is of the wicked dead, with endless punishment of such. So much of the foregoing as Brethren deem part of their special testimony they describe as "recovered truth." The germinant idea is that of the Church's ruin. In their principal points of doctrine they have been anticipated by other bodies or by individual thinkers; but they believe that men such as Darby have presented these with more light and power.

E. E. Whitfield.

Bibliography: For the authoritative literature of the denomination use the writings named in the articles on J. N. Darby, W. Kelly, G. Mueller, and B. W. Newton as their productions, together with the works cited in the bibliographies there appended. A considerable literature, mainly controversial and antagonistic to the Plymouth Brethren, is given in the *British Museum Catalogue* under "Plymouth Brethren." Consult further: W. B. Neatby, *Hist. of the Plymouth Brethren*, London, 1902 (critical and accurate); J. J. H[erzog], in *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung*, xxxiv (1844), nos. 23–26, 28–33; S. P. Tregelles, *Three Letters to the Author of "A Retrospect of Events . among the Brethren,"* London, 1849; *Memoir and Correspondence of A. N. Groves*, by his wife, London, 1855; F. Estéoul, *Le Plymouthisme d'autrefois et le Darbyisme d'aujourdhui*, Paris, 1858; H. Groves, *Darbyism: its Rise and Development*, London, 1866; E. Dennett, *The Plymouth Brethren*, London, 1871; J. Grant, *The Plymouth Brethren, their History and Heresies*, London, 1875; E. J. Whately, *Plymouth Brethrenism*, London, 1877; T. Croskery, *Plymouth-Brethrenism: a Refutation of its Principles and Doctrines*, London, 1879; J. C. L. Carson, *The Heresies of the Plymouth Brethren*, London, 1883; W. Reid, *Plymouth Brethrenism Unveiled and Refuted*, Edinburgh, 1883; J. S. Teulon, *The Hist. and Teaching of the Plymouth Brethren*, London [1883]; *Life among the Close Brethren*, London, 1890; J. R. Gregory, *The Gospel of Separation*, London, 1894; A. Miller, *Plymouthism and the Modern Churches*, Toronto, 1900.

PNEUMATOMACHI. See Macedonius and the Macedonian Sect.

POACH, ANDREAS. See Antinomianism, II., 1, § 5.

PNEUMATICS: The highest of three classes of natures (pneumatic, psychic, and hylic) assumed as human by Gnostics. The superiority of the pneumatics is regarded as resting upon the ground that to them had been communicated the higher truths of the world of eons because they alone were capable of understanding such truths. Those possessing the pneumatic nature were known also as "the elect," and were regarded as not under the dominion of the archon or world-ruler and also not subject to the restraints of the demiurge. They therefore live on as strangers in the world, perceiving as from afar the reality of the things of a higher world. Their innermost characteristic is their essential relationship with God, resulting in a life of undivided unity, exalted above the antithesis of rest and motion. Their blessedness is described as due to a union between the *sōtēr* (savior) and wisdom (*sophia*). They are to be found not only in the Christian Church, but are scattered in the pagan world, the evidence of this being found in the agreement of much of pagan doctrine with Christian truth. In the Christian Church, they are its salt and its soul, the real propagators of Christianity.

The name has at various times in the history of the Christian Church been adopted because of its signification ("the spirituals") by parties or sects, as by the followers of a French Anabaptist named Ambrose (fl. c. 1559), who professed to have received revelations which transcended in value those of the Bible.

Bibliography: Besides the literature under Gnostics, consult Neander, *Christian Church*, vol. i. passim.

POBIEDONOSTSEV, pō″bi-e″do-nes′tzeff, KONSTANTIN PETROVICH: Greek Orthodox; b. at Moscow 1827; d. at St. Petersburg Mar. (10) 23, 1907 After completing his studies at the Imperial Law School at St. Petersburg, he was successively

secretary and chief secretary of the Senate of Moscow, later becoming professor of civil law at the university of the same city. In 1860 he was appointed tutor to the princes of the blood royal, including the future Emperor Alexander III., and in 1863 accompanied another of the princes in his travels through Russia. Pobiedonostsev was created a senator in 1868 and in 1872 became a member of the cabinet. His chief activity, however, began in 1880, when he was made chief procurator of the Holy Synod, a position which he retained until his retirement from active life in 1905. In this high office, his devotion to the principles of autocratic government and his firm adherence to the welfare of the Greek Orthodox Church exposed him to the enmity of the revolutionary factions and the attacks of rationalists and Protestants of all shades. Nevertheless his course was unswerving and consistent throughout—personally fearless and deeply impressed with the righteousness of his cause, he acted with a severity which could not fail to bring upon him the hatred of those whom his measures affected. Besides a Russian translation of the *Imitatio Christi* (St. Petersburg, 1869), he wrote "Letters on the Travels of the Imperial Heir Apparent in Russia" (in collaboration with I. K. Bast; Moscow, 1864); "Course of Civil Law" (3 vols., St. Petersburg, 1868–91); and "Historical Investigations on the State" (1876). His *Reflexions of a Russian Statesman* have been translated into English by R. C. Long (London, 1898).

POCOCK (POCOCKE), EDWARD: Orientalist; b. at Oxford Nov. 8, 1604; d. there Sept. 10, 1691. He was educated at Oxford (B.A., 1622; M.A., 1626; B.D., 1636); elected fellow of Corpus Christi College, 1628; became chaplain to the English factory at Aleppo, 1630–36 (during which time he made a collection of Greek and oriental manuscripts and coins on commission of Archbishop Laud); professor of Arabic at Oxford, 1636–40; was in Constantinople to seek for manuscripts, 1637–40; rector of Childrey, Berkshire, 1642–47; professor of Hebrew and canon of Christ Church, 1647–48; lost the canonry and the two lectureships in 1650; though in the same year the lectureships were restored to him, and in 1660 the canonry; and in spite of opposition from Roundheads, and the indifference of Cavaliers, he retained these positions till his death. He was one of the foremost orientalists in his day. His works are numerous and valuable. His *Theological Works* were published with a *Life* by the editor, Leonard Twells (2 vols., London, 1740). They embrace *Porta Mosis* (a Latin translation of Maimonides' six discourses prefatory to his commentary upon the Mishna, 1655), Commentaries on Hosea (1685), Joel (1691), Micah and Malachi (1677), and a Latin treatise upon ancient weights and measures. The commentaries formed part of Fell's projected commentary upon the entire Old Testament. They are heavy and prolix, but learned. Pocock took a prominent part in Walton's *Polyglot*, furnished the collations of the Arabic Pentateuch, and was consulted by Walton at every step (see Bibles, Polyglot, IV.). He translated Grotius' *De veritate Christianæ religionis* (1660) and the Church of England Liturgy and Catechism into Arabic (1674). His chief work was his edition of *Gregorii Abul Farajii historia dynastiarum*, Arabic text with Latin translation (2 vols., Oxford, 1663).

Bibliography: Besides the *Life* in the *Theological Works*, ut sup., reprinted in *The Lives of Dr. Edward Pocock, Dr. Zachary Pearce, etc.*, ed. L. Twells, 2 vols., London, 1816, consult: *The Remains of John Locke, viz.*, 1. *Memoirs of the Life of Dr. E. Pococke*, London, 1714; *DNB*, xlvi. 7–12.

PODEBRAD (PODIEBRAD) AND KUNSTATT, GEORGE OF: King of Bohemia (1458–71); b. at Podebrad (30 m. e. of Prague) Apr. 23, 1420; d. at Prague Mar. 22, 1471. From 1444 he had been the leader of the utraquist party (see Huss, John, Hussites, II., §§ 3, 7). On the death of Ladislas he was elected king of Bohemia by the diet, and his reign marks the decisive period in the religious history of Bohemia. The Hussites had been in a manner reconciled to the Church by the compacts made with the Council of Basel (1433; see Huss, John; Hussites, II., § 6). The papacy neither accepted nor disavowed the compacts, and hoped to bring back Bohemia to Roman Catholicism. Podebrad wished to unite Bohemia and organize it into a great power; but this was impossible so long as it was rent by religious discord and, through want of papal recognition, was isolated from European politics. He accordingly tried to accomplish his purpose by skilful diplomacy with the popes, Calixtus III. and Pius II. At last Pius II. was alarmed at his increasing influence in Germany, and in 1462 disclaimed the compacts, and demanded Podebrad's unconditional obedience. At first Podebrad temporized, and, when he proposed to the various courts of Europe the summoning of a parliament of temporal princes, Pius II. excommunicated him in 1496. His successor, Paul II., authorized the formation of a league of discontented nobles, and called Mathias Corvinus, king of Hungary, to the aid of the Church; but Podebrad was not conquered, and, after his death, the Bohemian crown was given by the diet to Ladislas II.

Bibliography: Creighton, *Papacy*, vol. iii. passim; Pastor, *Popes*, iv. 134–146; M. Jordan, *Das Königthum Georgs von Podiebrad*, Leipsic, 1861; F. Palacky, *Geschichte von Böhmen*, vol. iv., Prague, 1857; idem, *Urkundliche Beiträge im Zeitalter Georgs von Podiebrad*, Vienna, 1860; E. H. Gillett, *Life and Times of John Huss*, ii. 550–551, 562–563, New York, 1870; E. J. Whately, *The Gospel in Bohemia*, London, 1877; H. Ermisch, *Geschichte der sächsisch-böhmischen Beziehungen 1464–71*, Dresden, 1881; F. Luetzow, *Bohemia*, London, 1896; C. E. Maurice, *Bohemia*, London and New York, 1896; *Monumenta Vaticana res gestas Bohemias illustrantia*, Prague, 1903; H. Apianus, *Geschichte Böhmens*, Leipsic, 1905; E. Schwitzky, *Der europäische Fürstenbund Georgs von Podiebrad*, Marburg, 1907; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, vol. viii. passim; and the literature under Pius II.

POEMS, ANONYMOUS, IN THE EARLY CHURCH: A small group of compositions of unknown authorship and of relatively small poetic excellence, though not without interest for the history of literature, dogma, and culture.

1. Carmen adversus Marcionem: A refutation of Marcionistic dualism in five books, containing 1,302 clumsy hexameters. The first book attacks heresy in general and Marcionism in particular; the second shows the harmony of the Old and the New

Testament; the third demonstrates the unity of Church doctrine with the teaching of the Old Testament, of Christ, and of the apostles; the fourth refutes Marcionistic tenets one by one; and the fifth considers the antitheses. The place, date, and authorship of the poem are too problematical to admit of even plausible solution, though the implication of the anonymous *De duodecim scriptoribus ecclesiasticis* that the poet was a certain Bishop Victorinus (most likely Victorinus of Pettau [q.v.]) deserves serious consideration.

2-3. Carmina de Sodoma; Carmen de Jona: Two poems of 166 and 105 hexameters respectively, ascribed by a number of manuscripts to Tertullian or Cyprian. Their use of the Itala shows that they can scarcely have been written later than 400. They may be fragments of some longer poem, and are characterized by a considerable degree of artistic merit.

4. Carmen de Genesi: A fragmentary composition in hexameters, often printed in the works of Tertullian and Cyprian, and representing the first part of a poetic version of the Heptateuch contained in a few manuscripts. It has been suggested that the poem was written by a Cyprian who lived in Gaul early in the fifth century, though others have distinguished two authors in the fragment.

5. Carmen de Judicio Domini, or **Ad Flavium Felicem de resurrectione mortuorum:** A poem variously ascribed to Tertullian and Cyprian, though showing close affinities to Commodian and the *Carmen adversus Marcionem*. On the basis of Isidore of Seville (*De vir. ill.*, vii.), it may not improbably be ascribed to Verecundus of Junca in Byzacene (d. about 552), despite certain differences in style.

6. Carmen ad Senatorem ex Christiana Religione ad Idola Conversum: A poem of eighty-five hexameters ascribed by the manuscripts to Cyprian, expressing the hope that a renegade senator, possibly Flavianus, prefect of the city of Rome (late fourth century), might ultimately return to Christianity.

7. Carmen de Pascha: An allegorical composition of sixty-nine hexameters, also called *De cruce* and *De ligno vitæ*. It gives the history of Christianity from the crucifixion to the sending of the Holy Ghost, and though assigned both to Cyprian and to Victorinus Afer, probably dates from the fifth century.

8. Carmen de Passione Domini: A poem of eighty hexameters printed with the works of Lactantius, but probably written between 1495 and 1500, perhaps by its anonymous first editor (Venice, 1501).

9. Carmen de Laudibus Domini: A panegyric in 148 hexameters, composed in Gaul, probably between 316 and 323, by a contemporary of Juvencus, perhaps resident in Flavia Ædua (the modern Autun).

10. Carmen adversus Flavianum: A poem of 122 hexameters, polemizing against the advocates of paganism, especially Clavianus, prefect of Rome. Since the latter fell in the rebellion against Theodosius I., the poem was written in or shortly after 394.

11. Carmen de Fratribus Septem Macchabæis Interfectis ab Antiocho Epiphane: A poetic version of II Macc. vii. in two recensions, one of 394 hexameters, and the other of 389. It has been ascribed, though without sufficient reason, both to Hilary of Arles and to Victorinus Afer.

12. Carmen de Jesu Christo et de Homine: A poem of 137 hexameters on the redemptive work of Christ, conjecturally assigned to Victorinus of Pettau or to some later Christian grammarian.

13-14. Carmen de Lege Domini and **Carmen de Nativitate, Vita, Passione et Resurrectione Domini:** Two poems, one of 106 and the other of 216 hexameters, ascribed to a certain Victorinus. They treat of the Old and New Testaments respectively, and are a cento from the *Carmen adversus Marcionem* (see above).

15. Carmen de Providentia Divina: A long poem seeking to refute skepticism regarding the divine governance of the world. It was composed in southern Gaul about 415, but though in phrase and versification it resembles the work of Prosper of Aquitaine (q.v.), to whom the manuscripts ascribe it, its tendency toward semi-Pelagianism makes such an identification impossible.

16-17 Metrum in Genesin and **De Evangelio:** Two poems ascribed by the manuscripts to Hilary of Poitiers (apparently an error for Hilary of Arles). The first poem is a paraphrase of Gen. i.–ix. in 204 hexameters; the second is a mere fragment.

18. Christos Pashon, or **Christus Patiens:** A Greek drama of 2,640 iambic trimeters erroneously ascribed to Gregory Nazianzen, really written at earliest in the eleventh century by an unknown author. It is a cento from the Greek tragedians (especially Euripides), the Bible, and such older apocryphal writings as the Protevangelium of James. The prologue, spoken by the Virgin, announces the author's intention of narrating the passion in Euripidean style; and the *dramatis personæ* are Christ, the Virgin (the leading rôle), Joseph of Arimathea, St. John the Divine, Mary Magdalene, Nicodemus, a messenger, Pilate, the high priests, a chorus of maidens, a semi-chorus, young men, and the watch. The whole is a closet drama, and is the only known instance of a Greek attempt to produce a passion play. (G KRÜGER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Works to be used in general are: J. F. C. Bähr, *Die christliche Dichter und Geschichtsschreiber*, Carlsruhe, 1872; A. Ebert, *Allgemeine Geschichte der Litteratur des Mittelalters*, Leipsic, 1889; M. Manitius, *Geschichte der christlich-lateinischen Poesie*, Stuttgart, 1891. For editions of the works under discussion: G. Fabricius, *Poetarum veterum ecclesiasticorum opera Christiana*, Basel, 1564; F. Oehler, *Tertulliani Opera*, Leipsic, 1854; G. Hartel, *Cypriani Opera*, Vienna, 1871; R. Peiper, *Cypriani Galli poetæ Heptateuchos*, Vienna, 1891.

On 1 consult for editions: Fabricius, ut sup., pp. 257–286; Oehler, ut sup., 781–798; and for discussions: Bähr, ut sup., pp. 21–22; Ebert, ut sup., p. 312, no. 1; Manitius, ut sup., 148–156; E. Hückstädt, *Ueber das pseudotertullianische Gedicht adv. Marcionem*, Leipsic, 1875 (cf. A. Hilgenfeld, in *ZWT*, xix (154–159); A. Oxé, *Prolegomena de carmine adv. Marcionitos*, Leipsic, 1888; J. Ziehen, *Zur Geschichte der Lehrdichtung in der spätrömischen Litteratur*, in *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum*, i (1898), 409.

On 2–4, for editions consult: the edition of 2 by G. Morelius, Paris, 1560; Fabricius, 298–302; Oehler, ut sup., 769–776; Hartel, ut sup., 283–301; Peiper, ut sup., 1–7, 212–226; for discussions consult. Bähr, ut sup., pp. 34, 41; Ebert, ut sup., 118–224; Manitius, ut sup., 51–54, 167–170; H. Best, *De Cypriani quæ feruntur metris in Heptateucham*, Marburg, 1891.

On 5 for editions consult: Fabricius, ut sup., pp. 286–294; Oehler, ut sup., pp. 776–781, Hartel, ut sup., pp. 308–325; and for discussions: Bähr, ut sup., p. 23; Manitius, ut sup., 344–348; O. Bardenhewer, *Patrologie*, Freiburg, 1901, Eng. transl., St. Louis, 1908.

On 6 for editions consult: Hartel, ut sup., pp. 302–305; Peiper, ut sup., 227–230; for discussions, Bähr, ut sup., p. 24; Ebert, ut sup., pp. 313–314; Manitius, ut sup., pp. 130–133.

For the rest the works already cited are available. Additional sources for one or more are: S. Brandt, *Ueber das dem Lact. zugeschriebene Gedicht*, Leipsic, 1891; W. Brandes, *Ueber die frühchristliche Gedicht Laudes Domini*, Brunswick, 1887; (on 10) G. Delisle, in *Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes*, ser. 6, vol. iii., pp. 297 sqq., Paris, 1867, and T. Mommsen, in *Hermes*, iv (1869), 350–363; (on 13–14): A. Mai, *Classici auctores*, v. 382–385, Rome, 1833, and A. Oxe, *Victorini versus de lege Domini*, Crefeld, 1894. For editions of 18 that of Bladus, Rome, 1542, and that in *MPG*, xxxviii. 131–338 may be named; and the later ones of F. Dübner, Paris, 1846; J. G. Brambs, Leipsic, 1885; A. Ellison, ib. 1885 (Greek and German; useful for the list of literature and the introduction); Germ. transl. by E. A. Pullig, Bonn, 1893. Consult Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, pp. 746–748 (also with lists of literature).

POESCHL, pō'shl, **THOMAS:** Austrian chiliast; b. at Höritz (20 m. s.w. of Budweis), Bohemia, Mar. 2, 1769; d. at Vienna Nov. 15, 1837 He was educated for the Roman Catholic priesthood at Linz and Vienna, and after ordination became, in 1804, cooperator, catechist, and director of the school at Braunau-on-the-Inn. In 1806 he attended the Protestant Johann Philipp Palm at his execution, and became filled with wild hatred of Napoleon, while his impassioned sermons caused some to regard him as a saint and others as a maniac. At this crisis he came into contact with the mystic and chiliastic Roman Catholic "Brothers and Sisters in Zion," and was accordingly removed to Ampfelwang, whither the "Brothers and Sisters" also transferred their headquarters. The great battle of Leipsic, however, caused his insanity to become unmistakable. Supported by the revelations of a certain Magdalena Sickinger, he now proclaimed himself called to convert the Jews and to found the true Judeo-Catholic Church. In spite of all efforts to suppress him, he continued to promulgate his doctrines at Vöcklabruck and Salzburg. Finally, in 1817, he was committed to the hospital for the clergy at Vienna, where he remained until his death.

Under the leadership of a peasant named Johann Haas, the followers of Pöschl went on to still wilder vagaries than their leader, though without falling into sensuality or giving a single addition to Protestantism. Even when deserted by Haas and Magdalena Sickinger, they remained true to Pöschl, who had adherents a generation later, not only in Bohemia, but also in Baden, Franconia, Hesse, and Frankfort, while in 1831 some fifty emigrated to Louisiana, where they made an unsuccessful attempt at communism. His three great tenets were the indwelling of Christ in the heart through faith, the conversion of the Jews, and the repentance of the Christians; and he likewise advocated the use of the vernacular in the liturgy, the administration of the Eucharist under both kinds, and the rejection of images. (Georg Loesche.)

Bibliography: L. Würth, *Die protestantische Pfarrey Vöklabruck (1812–1825). Ein Beitrag zur Kenntniss . der Pöschlianer*, Marktbreit, 1825; M. Hiptmair, *Thomas Pöschl im Lichte seiner Selbstbiographie*, Vienna, 1893; T. Wiedemann, *Die religiöse Bewegung in Oberösterreich . . beim Beginne des 19. Jahrhunderts*, Innsbruck, 1890; *ADB*, xxvi. 454–455; *KL*, x. 118–121.

POETRY, HEBREW. See Hebrew Language and Literature, III.

POHLE, pō'le, **JOSEPH:** German Roman Catholic; b. at Niederspay (7 m. s. of Coblenz) Mar. 19, 1852. He was educated at the Gregorian University, Rome (1871–79; Ph.D., 1874; D.D., 1879), and the University of Würzburg (1879–81); was teacher in the intermediate school at Baar, Switzerland (1881–83), professor of dogmatic theology in St. Joseph's College, Leeds, England, (1883–86), professor of philosophy at Fulda, Prussia (1886–89), professor of apologetics at the Catholic University of America (1889–94), and professor of dogmatic theology at the University of Münster (1894–97). Since 1897 he has been professor of the same subject at the University of Breslau. He has been one of the editors of the *Philosophisches Jahrbuch der Görresgesellschaft* since its establishment in 1888, and has written *P. Angelo Secchi, S. J., Ein Lebens- und Kulturbild aus dem neunzehnten Jahrhundert* (Cologne, 1883); *Die Sternenwelten und ihre Bewohner, zugleich als erste Einführung in die moderne Astronomie* (2 vols., 1883–84); and *Lehrbuch der Dogmatik für akademische Vorlesungen und zum Selbstunterricht* (3 vols., Paderborn, 1902–05, new ed., 1908).

POINTS OF AGREEMENT, HESSIAN. See Verbesserungspunkte, Hessische.

POIRET, pwā''rê', **PIERRE:** Prominent French mystic; b. at Metz Apr. 15, 1646; d. at Rijnsburg (3 m. n. of Leyden) May 21, 1719. After the early death of his parents, he supported himself by the engraver's trade and the teaching of French, at the same time studying theology, in Basel, Hanau, and, after 1668, Heidelberg. At Basel he was captivated by Descartes' philosophy, which never quite lost its hold on him. He read also Thomas à Kempis and Tauler, but was especially influenced by the writings of the Dutch Mennonite mystic Hendrik Jansz van Barneveldt, published about that time under the pseudonym of Emmanuel Hiel. In 1672 he became pastor of the French church at Annweiler in the duchy of Deux-Ponts. Here he became acquainted with Elisabeth, abbess of Hereford, the granddaughter of James I. of England and a noted mystic, with the *Theologia Germanica* (q.v.), and with the writings of Antoinette Bourignon (q.v.), which last supplied exactly what he wanted. The desire to make the acquaintance of this gifted woman took him to Holland in 1676. He settled in Amsterdam, and published there in the following year his *Cogitationes rationales de Deo, anima, et malo*, which gained him an immediate reputation for scholarship and philosophic insight. It is Cartesian in form; the Trinity is conceived in mathematical terms; all knowledge is to rest on evidence—but the end of this knowledge of God is practical, to lead distracted Christendom back to unity. The influence of Thomas à Kempis and Tauler is plainly visible.

From Holland Poiret went on to Hamburg, still

in quest of Antoinette Bourignon, was completely won by her at the first meeting, and until her death in 1680, he was her faithful disciple. He accompanied her in her wanderings, traveled several times as far as Holstein in connection with her exceedingly confused affairs, and returned to Amsterdam to see to the publication of her complete works, to which he prefixed a thoroughgoing defense of her and added a translation of the *Göttliche Gesicht* of Hans Engelbrecht (q.v.), the Brunswick enthusiast. He defended her character and divine mission in a *Mémoire touchant la vie de Mlle. A. Bourignon* (1679), and championed her cause against Bayle and Seckendorf. He was also a warm admirer of Jane Lead (q.v.). In 1688 he settled at Rijnsburg, where he busied himself on his own works and in multifarious labors for the Dutch booksellers, such as in the Dutch edition of Ruinart. Among his original productions may be mentioned *L'Économie divine, ou système universel et démontré des œuvres et des desseins de Dieu envers les hommes* (Amsterdam, 1687; Eng. transl., *The Divine Œconomy*, 6 vols., London, 1713), which purports to reproduce the visionary notions of Antoinette Bourignon, but at least gives them in intelligible and consistent form. Another work, *La Paix des âmes dans tous les partis du Christianisme* (1687), disregards the formal creeds of the various churches, and appeals to the minority of really sincere Christians, urging them to an inner union without the abandonment of their external affiliations. In *De eruditione solida, superficiaria et falsa* (1692), he distinguishes between superficial knowledge of the names of things and real or solid knowledge of the things themselves, which latter is to be attained by humble renunciation of one's own wisdom and will. He continued to make contributions to the philosophical and religious controversies of the time, as, for example, against Bayle and his "hypocritical" opposition to Spinoza. The work which probably ran through the most editions was the little treatise on the education of children which first appeared in 1690 in a collection of his shorter writings, was frequently translated, and influenced the Pietistic controversy at Hamburg. His most permanently valuable contribution was *Bibliotheca mysticorum selecta* (1708), which displays an astonishing acquaintance with ancient and modern mystics, and contains valuable information on some of the less-known writers. He also published a large number of mystical writings both from the Middle Ages and from the French Pietists of the seventeenth century. In 1704 he brought out a new edition of Mme. Guyon's writings, with the addition of a treatise printed for the first time and an introduction. In spite of his devotion to her, he was not a Quietist in the ordinary sense of the word. He would not have man's relation to God one of pure passivity but of receptivity. He repudiated predestination, and condemned Pelagianism because it suppressed the feeling of inherent sinfulness in man—just as he opposed Socinianism because it did not ascribe the whole of salvation to the operation of God's grace. Mystic as he was, he knew how to combine with his own peculiar attitude a firm insistence on certain dogmatic definitions, such as that of the Trinity. He continually appealed to the authority of Scripture. Though after 1680 he led a quiet and retired life, he was recognized widely by the scholars of his time, such as Thomasius and Bayle, Le Clerc and Walch, as a man of great learning; and his zealous participation in the cause of Antoinette Bourignon did not injure his good name as a devout mystic and an honorable man. His influence persisted after his death, not merely through the work of his spiritual son Tersteegen, but through the respect which his writings won for mysticism, forcing the regular theology, as represented by Le Clerc, Lange, Buddeus, Walch, and Stapfer, to take account of it.

S. Cramer.

Bibliography: The one source, contemporary, exact, and detailed, sent by Poiret himself to Ancillon and after Poiret's death printed in Latin in the *Bibliotheca Bremensis*, iii. 1, Bremen, 1720, is printed as *Kort Verhael van des Schryvers Petrus Poirets leven en Schriften* in *De goddelyke Huishouding*, ii. 31–86, 1723. Next to this the best references are to A. Ijpeij, *Geschiedenis van de Kristelyke Kerk in de achttiende Eeuw*, x. 510–531, Utrecht, 1809; idem, *Geschiedenis der systematische Godgeleerdheid*, iii. 46–61; and M. Göbel, *Geschichte des christlichen Lebens in der rheinisch-westphälischen evangelischen Kirche*, vol. iii., Coblenz, 1860. The more general works on Mysticism (see the bibliography there) have practically nothing additional to what is contained in the preceding—cf. R. A. Vaughan, *Hours with the Mystics*, ii. 290, 8th ed., London, n.d.

POISSY, pwā″sî′, **RELIGIOUS CONFERENCE OF:** A conference held in Sept., 1561, between Protestants and Roman Catholics at Poissy (10 m. n.w. of Paris). The wide diffusion of Protestantism in France led the queen regent, Catherine de Medici, to seek to establish some peaceable understanding between the two confessions. After the assembly of notables at Fontainebleau in Aug., 1560, and the general assembly of the estates at Orléans (Dec. 13, 1560–Jan. 31, 1561), the nobility and the third estate gathered at Pontoise, while the court and the clergy met at the abbey of Poissy. The assembly, which was partly to prepare for the expected reopening of the Council of Trent, partly as a sort of national council to promote the reformation of the French Church, and partly to diminish the debt of the State out of the treasury of the Church, was convened July 28, 1651. The assurance, in the king's name, of the Chancellor Michel de L'Hôpital (q.v.) to the bishops and archbishops that there was to be a reformation not only of abuses but also of doctrine, received a very limited approval, and still more so that the Reformed also were to be heard. A review of the preliminaries is necessary properly to understand the call of colloquy. Theodore Beza (q.v.) and colleagues came to Worms in 1557 in behalf of the Evangelicals imprisoned by Henry II. at Paris, and when the Germans requested a confession of faith, the French returned a statement of entire agreement with the Augsburg Confession with the exception of the article on the Eucharist, holding out the prospect, however, of future agreement. The result was that Elector Otto Heinrich interceded with the French king. Meanwhile relations became more strained: Frederick went over to Calvinism, and strict Lutheranism was emphasized in Würtemberg. When King Antoine of Navarre, for the

Purposes and Preliminaries.

French kingdom, demanded intercessory delegations to the court in behalf of the Protestants, he was advised to accept the Augsburg Confession, especially on the Eucharist. Duke Christopher of Württemberg, on June 12, sent to Antoine and to the duke of Guise an envoy with copies of the Augsburg Confession, the new Württemberg Confession, and various books of the Lutheran theologians. Christopher's envoy found the convention of prelates already in prospect, and the duke's suggestion that Protestant theologians take part in the proceedings obtained royal approval. The Roman Catholics, in their turn, expected to refute the Protestants by the Bible and the Church Fathers and drive the Reformed to the wall. Beza and Peter Martyr Vermigli (q.v.) were the Reformed theologians invited to attend the colloquy. The German princes were also asked to send theologians, but they were unable to agree on any uniform instructions to their delegates and the plan was consequently abandoned. Beza enjoyed a cordial welcome both at Paris and the court at St. Germain, and on the Sunday evening after his arrival was invited by Antoine to an assembly which included Catherine, Condé, and the cardinals of Bourbon and Lorraine. Here a conversation was carried on between Beza and the cardinal of Lorraine, in which the latter minimized the differences of Eucharistic doctrine between himself and Beza, concluding by inviting the Reformed theologian to visit him that they might cooperate for some agreement between Roman Catholics and Protestants. Shortly afterward it was invidiously rumored at St. Germain and abroad that Beza had been worsted in argument by the cardinal. Some days before Beza's arrival the Reformed preachers had presented a memorial thanking the king for their safe conduct and requesting him to submit to the consideration of the prelates the French Reformed confession (see Gallican Confession). This petition was graciously received by the king on Aug. 17, and on Aug. 26 the prelates, yielding to the wish of Catherine, decided to hear the Reformed. Attempts were made to keep the king himself from attending, but in vain; and on Sept. 9 the conference began in the refectory of the great Nunnery at Poissy. There were present the king, his mother, the princes and princesses royal, high dignitaries of the crown, and many courtiers; while from among the lords spiritual were present the cardinals of Tournon, Lorraine, Chatillon, Armagnac, Bourbon, and Guise; the archbishops of Bordeaux and Embrun, thirty-six bishops, representatives of absent prelates, many deputies of abbeys and monasteries, and theologians and professors of the Sorbonne. The Reformed were represented by twenty delegates and fourteen elders.

The Sessions.

After preliminary addresses by the king and chancellor, Beza delivered a long address in which he sought to demonstrate the patriotism and peacefulness of his party and gave a brief summary of the Reformed doctrines to show that they differed in very essential points from tenets previously held, and that they did not reject each and every fundamental principle of Christianity so as to be on a plane of those of Jews and Mohammedans. This presentation contained many citations for authority from the Fathers. When, however, Beza spoke of the Eucharist, and declared that the body of Christ was as far from the bread as the highest heaven is from the earth, he was interrupted with vehement disapproval. He was followed by Cardinal Tournon, who expressed his entire disapproval of Beza's attitude and concluded the session by demanding a written copy of the Reformed leader's address, which was apparently altered by Beza before it was printed. For the second session the prelates entrusted the cardinal of Lorraine with the refutation of Beza. The Roman Catholic reply was to comprise the following four doctrines: the Church and her authority; the powers of councils to represent the entire Church, which includes not only the elect, but also the non-elect; the authority of the Scriptures; and the real and substantial presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist. This was to be followed by the presentation of a creed controverting the Reformed confession and by pronouncing condemnation on the preachers if they should refuse to accept it, after which the conference was to be closed. The Protestants, learning of this, protested to the king, who obliged the prelates to defer their proposed condemnation and adjournment. The second session took place on Sept. 16, and was opened by the cardinal of Lorraine. Expressing the pleasure of the prelates to learn that the Reformed were in harmony with the Apostles' Creed, he yet called attention to other points in which they deviated from Roman Catholic teaching. In his discussion of the Eucharist, the cardinal carefully avoided all offensive phraseology, and even avoided references to transubstantiation and the mass, speaking of the real presence in a quasi-Lutheran sense. Discussion and a copy of the address were denied, to Beza's disappointment. On the following evening Catherine summoned Beza and Peter Martyr, the latter of whom expressed his hope of reaching an understanding if the Eucharistic problem were omitted from discussion and each one were permitted to believe and preach according as he was convinced by the word of God. The queen expressed her intention of doing all in her power to bring about such an understanding. [It is a significant fact that at the conference while the Roman Catholic prelates were seated, the Protestants were required to remain standing.]

Results.

The further course of events was determined by the intervention of the papal legate, the cardinal of Ferrara, uncle of the duchess of Guise. He advised the queen to restrain the king, the cardinal of Tournon, and the majority of the prelates, from attending further conferences, pleading that an agreement might the more easily be reached if the irreconcilable spirits were absent. On Sept. 24, therefore, a conference was summoned with twelve representatives of each party; and the debate, which was without result, concluded with the question of the cardinal of Lorraine whether the Reformed were ready to subscribe to the Augsburg Confession. On the following day Montluc, bishop of Valence, and

D'Espence conferred, at the queen's command, with Beza and Nicolas des Gallards on a compromise formula. The result was as follows: "We believe that the true body and the true blood of Jesus Christ really and substantially, that is, in their proper substance, are, in a spiritual and ineffable manner, present and offered in the Holy Communion and that they are thus received by the faithful who communicate." When, on Sept. 26, negotiations were continued publicly, Beza declared that the Reformed could not accept this formula. The ultimate failure of compromise is perhaps due to the Jesuit general Lainez, who hitherto played his part under cover but, admitted to the colloquy on Sept. 26, vehemently and scurrilously attacked the Protestants, to whom Beza replied. The debate continued until late at night; and for further discussion a committee of five on each side was appointed; among the Roman Catholics being Montluc and D'Espence, and among the Reformed Beza and Peter Martyr. After three conferences (Sept. 29, Oct. 1, and Oct. 3) a formula was reached teaching the real presence, of which the substance was given through the operation of the Holy Ghost, the body of Christ being received spiritually and through faith. All at court were satisfied, but when the formula was submitted to the assembled prelates on Oct. 9, the majority declared the formula heretical. A rigidly Roman Catholic formula was immediately drawn up, and it was resolved to give no further hearing to the Reformed after their refusal to subscribe, and to urge the king to banish the recalcitrants. Negotiations were broken off at Poissy on Oct. 9. Ten days later five German theologians arrived at Paris, Michael Diller, Peter Bouquin, Jakob Beurlin, Jakob Andreä (qq.v.) and Balthasar Bidembach, summoned to explain the Augsburg articles. Their leader Beurlin died on Oct. 28 and on Nov. 8 the rest were received in audience by the king of Navarre, who expressed a wish that they would bear witness to the harmony between the Augsburg Confession and the compromise formula at the conclusion of negotiations at Poissy. After many futile conferences on the union of German and French Protestantism, and, after having explained to the king the meaning of the Augsburg Confession and urged him to accept it, the envoys were finally dismissed on Nov. 23. The conference at Poissy had shown that reconciliation between Roman Catholics and Protestants on the basis of mutual concession was entirely impossible, and that the only alternatives were mutual toleration or a war for existence.

(Eugen Lachenmann.)

Bibliography: H. M. Baird, *Hist. of the Rise of the Huguenots*, i. 505–546, London, 1880; Theodore Beza, *Hist. ecclésiastique des églises réformées . de France*, Geneva, 1580, new ed., ed. P. Vesson, 2 vols., Toulouse, 1882–83, and, in 3 vols., ed. J. W. Baum and A. E. Cunitz, Paris, 1883–88; J. W. Baum, *Theodor Beza*, vol. ii., Berlin, 1852; G. de Félice, *Hist. des protestants de France*, pp. 131 sqq., Toulouse, 1850, new ed., 1861, Eng. transl., 2 vols., London, 1853; G. von Polenz, *Geschichte des französischen Calvinismus*, ii. 47 sqq., Gotha, 1859; N. A. F. Puaux, *Hist. de la réformation française*, ii. 101 sqq., Paris, 1860; H. Klipffel, *La Colloque de Poissy*, Paris, 1868; A. de Ruble, *Le Journal de Claude d'Espence*, in *Mémoires de la société d'histoire de Paris*, xvi., 1889; H. Amphoux, *Michel de l'Hôpital*, pp. 185 sqq., Paris, 1900.

POLAND, CHRISTIANITY IN.

I. Before the Reformation.
Slavic Foundations (§ 1).
German Influence and Organization (§ 2).
Reaction and Turmoils (§ 3).
Ecclesiastical Independence (§ 4).
II. The Reformation and After.
Need and Preparation (§ 1).
Reformation (§ 2).
Counter-Reformation (§ 3).
Later History (§ 4).

I. Before the Reformation: When Poland received Christianity in the tenth century, it comprised the territory between the Russian grand-duchy in the east, Prussia and Pomerania in the northeast and north, the Wendish tribes in the northwest, the German empire as far as the Oder in the west, and Moravia in the south and southwest. After Duke Mieczyslaw of Poland had been defeated in 963 by the Wends, he sought protection from them by submission to the German emperor. But in spite of the favorable opportunity thus afforded for the introduction of Christianity from Germany, no efforts were made in this direction. Christianity was introduced as a resultant of the Slavonic mission of the Greek-Oriental Church; and, in particular, according to the oldest and most reliable reports from Bohemia, where it had obtained a permanent foothold under Duke Boleslaw I. the Pious. Duke Mieczyslaw married in 966 Dambrowka, the sister of Boleslaw II., duke of Bohemia, and in 967 accepted Christianity, followed immediately by the nobles and a part of the people. Further expansion was promoted by priests from Bohemia; and at the order of the duke all his subjects were baptized. All idols were to be broken, burned, or thrown into the water.

1. Slavic Foundations.

At this point Germany began missionary work in Poland. Under the protection of the emperor, Jordan, a German priest, worked with great zeal and under many difficulties, as missionary. The Poles had indeed accepted Christianity after the example of their duke, nominally; but in secret they were still attached to their old gods, and at a later time heathenism was yet strong enough to produce a reaction. The ecclesiastical organization of the country soon followed the acceptance of Christianity by the duke. This could not possibly have been accomplished by the efforts of the Slavonic-Greek mission; but the close political connection of Poland with Germany and the feudal relation of the duke to the emperor effected in the course of time close relations with the German-Occidental Church, and from these a firm foundation and organization of Polish Christianity procceded. Mieczyslaw, in 977, after the death of his first wife, married Oda, the daughter of the Saxon Margrave Dietrich, under whose influence the Greek rite gave way to the Roman forms of church service (see Roman Catholics, "Uniate Churches"). Otto the Great conceived comprehensive plans for a permanent Christianization of the Slavonic people who were compelled to submit to his power. At his instance and with his cooperation, the first Polish bishopric, Posen,

2. German Influence and Organization.

was founded in 968. At first included under the archbishopric of Mainz, it was later incorporated in the archbishopric of Magdeburg. Thus the connection of the Polish Church with the Roman Church was established, and under the influence of the political conditions the Roman Church gained the ascendency over the unwilling Greek element. As the Roman missionaries from Germany did not speak the Polish language, they could not gain that influence over the people to which the Slavonic missionaries owed most of their success. Conflicts arose, and it became very difficult to introduce the institutions of the Roman Church. The pope found it necessary to make temporary concessions; and preaching and liturgy were allowed in the vernacular. Until his death in 992 Mieczyslaw remained a faithful adherent of the imperial power. Under his son from his first marriage, Boleslaw Chrobry, " the Brave " (992 to 1025), one of the most powerful and valiant of the old Polish dukes, the tie of Poland with the Roman Church became still closer. Although Poland had not been fully Christianized even externally, it became under him a center for the further expansion of Christianity among the neighboring peoples, in that he made the mission serve his warlike undertakings. Boleslaw Chrobry had safeguarded St. Adalbert (see ADALBERT OF PRAGUE) on his missionary tour to Prussia and afterward redcemed his remains; and over his grave in Gnesen he contracted an intimate friendship with Emperor Otto III. Gnesen became an archbishopric and the center of the Polish Church. Seven bishoprics were placed under its jurisdiction, among them Colberg, Cracow, and Breslau; and thus there was established the first comprehensive organization of the Polish Church. But with the foundation of the archbishopric of Gnesen Poland's connection with the archbishopric of Magdeburg and with the German Church and empire was loosened, and there gradually grew up a more immediate connection with Rome. As he had protected Adalbert on his missionary tour to Prussia, so Boleslaw aided powerfully the bold undertaking of Brun of Querfurt, the enthusiastic disciple of Adalbert, to bring the Gospel to the wild people of the far east. Boleslaw also sent to Sweden missionaries whose efforts were very successful. The further he extended his power over the neighboring Slavonic people, the stronger became his desire for a great Christian-Slavonic kingdom, the crown of which he asked from the pope. In 1018 the Greek empire in Constantinople feared its power and the Russian kingdom, in the capital of which, Kief, he erected a Roman Catholic bishopric, succumbed to it.

3. Reaction and Turmoils.

After the external reception of Christianity, the people still clung tenaciously to heathenism. The annual celebration of the destruction of the old gods at which their images were thrown into the water, took place for a considerable time with the singing of dirges. Only by harsh penal codes were the uncultured minds of the people turned to the observance of Christian morals and church usages. Adultery and fornication were punished with mutilation, and eating of flesh during Lent with the knocking out of teeth. Mieczyslaw II. carried out his father's policy for the maintenance and extension of the Church. He built churches and founded a new bishopric, Cujavia, in the territory of the Wends on the Vistula. But the terrible disorders in Poland following his death in 1034 involved also the Church. The external and forced Christianization had been so ineffective that the very existence of the Church was threatened. Many of the nobility and the people fell back into heathenism; cities and churches were destroyed, and the laity rebelled against the clergy. From Germany efforts were no longer made to aid and strengthen the Polish Church. Under Conrad II. the archbishopric of Magdeburg had forgotten its missionary duty to the east and especially to Poland. Since 1035 its influence upon the Polish church and the latter's connection with the German Church ceased. The bishopric of Posen was placed under the archbishopric of Gnesen; Gnesen was destroyed by the duke of Bohemia; Casimir, the son of Mieczyslaw II., found refuge in Germany, and after the recovery of his inheritance reestablished the Church by placing land and church under the protection of the royal power of Germany. But a long time passed before the old order was reestablished. Under Boleslaw II., who had regained the throne, a terrible civil war ensued. In the following period the progress of the Church was hindered by political disturbances, so that prosperous development by the planting and fostering of Christian life was impossible, though the missionary activity of the Polish Church was revived under Boleslaw III. From Poland in the second quarter of the twelfth century the Christianization of Pomerania was accomplished by Otho of Bamberg, while Pomerania became politically dependent upon Poland. Strenuous efforts were made to expand the church in Prussia in order to subjugate it the more securely to the dominion of Poland. Such missionary efforts, however, did not indicate vigorous life in the Church so much as political energy in the sovereigns. The division of the kingdom after Boleslaw's death (1139) among his four sons wrought new ecclesiastical troubles and disturbances; and before the time of the Reformation peaceful developments did not obtain. The princes either showered possessions and privileges upon the clergy from selfish or party interests at the expense of the nobility and the people, whose hatred was thus intensified while the moral condition of the clergy was corrupted, or they violently attacked the rights and property of the bishoprics. A synod at Leucyka in 1180 forbade princes to appropriate the property of deceased bishops under penalty of excommunication. The favors of the princes to the clergy involved the latter in continual battles with the nobility; violent dissensions between clergy on the one side and nobility and laity on the other were caused by the payment of tithes to the Church, and by the arbitrary extension of clerical jurisdiction.

In close connection with the national element and the opposition of Slavism to Romanism and Teutonism, the opposition to the popes is one of the characteristic features of the Polish church.

The princes energetically guarded their right to fill bishoprics, granted them by Otto III. Pope Martin V. complained in letters to the king of Poland that the rights and liberties of the Church were trampled under foot and that the authority of the Holy See was not obeyed. The clergy shared with princes this desire for independence of the pope. Hence the complaint of Gregory VII. in a letter of 1075, "the bishops of your land are absolutely independent and unsubmissive to regulation." A bishop of Posen dared to refuse to announce an interdict of Innocent III. against one of the dukes. Marriage of priests had come in through the Greek origin of the Polish church; thence came general opposition to the law of celibacy among the Polish clergy. About 1120 all priests in the diocese of Breslau were married. In the middle of the twelfth century the majority of the Polish clergy were the same; and a synod of Gnesen (1219) complained that the former prohibitions of the marriage of priests had remained without effect. The appeal of the Polish nation from the pope to a general council at the time when Pope Martin V did not condemn the work of John of Falkenberg, the Dominican monk who in the interest of the Teutonic order had preached murder and rebellion against the Polish people and their king, was a memorable protest against the absolutism of the papacy. The immorality of the clergy, their simony, unchastity, political intriguing, and lack of church discipline produced an anticlerical and antiecclesiastical movement among the people. The religious needs of the country, which had been so shamefully disregarded by the clergy, were so urgent that the Reformation found open doors among the Poles.

4. Ecclesiastical Independence.

(David Erdmann†.)

II. Reformation and After: In the middle of the fifteenth century Poland bordered in the west upon Hungary, Bohemia, and Silesia; in the north on the Eastern Sea from Danzig to Courland; in the east it included Lithuania and the greater part of White Russia; and in the south, Red Russia, Volhynia, Podolia, and Kief; while its influence spread over Moldavia and Walachia (Roumania), and the Crimea. A grandson of Ladislas Jagiello (1348–1434) was king of Bohemia and Hungary. Relations by marriage brought neighboring dominions under the kings of Poland, which was now at the zenith of its power and extent. Three sons of Casimir (1444–92) became kings of Poland; the third one, Sigismund (1513–48), taking for second wife the Italian princess Bona Sforza, who wrought an influence detrimental to Poland and the Reformation. The heart of the kingdom, namely, Little Poland, was Slavic, and thus mild, peaceable, and deeply religious. Cyril and Methodius, the Slavic apostles of the ninth century, had translated a part of the Scriptures into the mother tongue; the pious people held firmly to worship in the vernacular and to ecclesiastical independence; and thus the foundation for the Reformation spirit was laid. The king was only the chief of the nobles, who in a century of strife had risen to an eminence of independence and power which stood also in defense of the bishops and resisted the popes. The bishops had been appointed by the lords for centuries and stood by their side; for they were first of all Poles. An archbishop of Gnesen had been regent. In 1176 Waldensians from the south of France and later the Hussites found refuge in Poland, in spite of the individual opposition of the bishops, the synods, and the Inquisition; and they were protected. As elsewhere so in Poland the revival of learning and humanism prepared the way for the Reformation. The classics were read by nobles and clergy; German and Italian scholars were welcomed; multitudes of young Poles returned from schools abroad, bringing back the spirit of the humanities; and Erasmus obtained the most enthusiastic admirers. But perhaps nowhere else was the moral and spiritual destitution so great as in Poland. The law of celibacy was generally violated among the priesthood; nepotism prevailed among the bishops; and ecclesiastical positions were sold to the highest bidder.

1. Need and Preparation.

The fires of the Reformation first broke into flame along the German border. As early as 1520 the Dominican Andreas Samuel at the cathedral of Posen and later John Seklucyan, a preacher at the church of Mary Magdalen, preached the Gospel, emphasizing the need of a reformation of the Church. In 1519, Jacob Knade, a vicar at the church of Peter and Paul in Danzig, married; and this step, together with his fearless reform preaching, met with wide public approval. In Posen, the castellan Lukas of Gorka received the Evangelical preachers under his protection against the bishop. The archbishop of Gnesen hurried to Danzig to suppress the movement but the magistrate upheld his right, even against the king, to permit Evangelical preaching and the entrance of the Reformation. From here it spread by way of Elbing into Prussia; George of Polentz, bishop of Samland, joined it; Albert of Brandenburg, Grand Master of the German Order in Prussia, called as preacher to Königsberg Johann Briessman (q.v.), Luther's follower (1525); and changed the territory of the order into a hereditary grand duchy under Polish protection. From these borderlands the movement penetrated Little Poland which was the nucleus for the extensive kingdom. All measures on the part of the church powers and king to stem the tide proved ineffective. In spite of the prohibition, especially against Wittenberg, the nobility continued to send its sons to the universities of Bologna, Padua, Orléans, and Paris, and even to Strasburg and Geneva, whence Calvin's "Institutes" were welcomed in Poland. The Italian Lismanin, confessor to Queen Bona, joined the Reformation; and placed himself as well as Prince Radziwil, chief reformer in Lithuania, in communication with Calvin. The latter dedicated his commentary on Hebrews to the king of Poland (1549), which honor the latter accepted. From 1545 a constantly widening circle of spiritually awakened Poles collected at the house of the eminent and wealthy Andreas Trzecieski of Cracow; among these were Wojewodka, later prefect of Cracow, Orzechowski, Przyluski, author of the "statues of the realm," and, in particular, Rej and

2. Reformation.

Fricius Modrevius. From this source the movement spread everywhere among the minor as well as the greater nobility; but the prime cause of the Reformation is to be sought in the deep religious sense of the Slavic people, who eagerly accepted the preaching of the Gospel in place of the means of the deteriorated Church. In the mean time the movement proceeded likewise among the nobles of Great Poland; here the type was Lutheran, instead of Reformed, as in Little Poland. Before the Reformation the Hussite refugees had found asylum here; now the Bohemian and Moravian brethren, soon to be known as the Unity of the Brethren (q.v.), were expelled from their home countries and, on their way to Prussia (1547), about 400 settled in Posen under the protection of the Gorka, Leszynski, and Ostrorog families. During 1553–1579, this band increased to seventy-nine congregations, due to their industrious and sane activity, during the quarter-century leadership of George Israel. In Little Poland, owing to political conditions, there was for a long time a lack of organic home leadership. The churches could not continue successfully under the control of Geneva and the Rhine. Efforts were made to import proper men from abroad, which resulted most wisely in the choice of Johannes a Lasco (q.v.). He was a Pole, acquainted with the Reformers of his native land, a fugitive first in East Friesland and then in England, and one who had specially proved his fitness for organization and leadership. His return was delayed and the Synod of Kozminek (1555), under the pressure of threatened disorganization, adopted a plan of union, the result of which would have meant absorption into the Unity of the Brethren. A year later, upon his arrival, Lasco insisted upon the integrity and independence of the home church. In the fifth decade of this century the movement entered into its final tests in the struggles of the bishops and the nobles of the Reformation in the diets. In the diet of 1552, Leszynski refused to bow the knee and remove the hat at the opening of the mass. This diet secured freedom of conscience by granting the Roman Catholic Church the right of judgment on heresies but not of penalty. The Diet of Warsaw (1556) provided that every noble was free to establish in his house and on his estate that worship which seemed to him fitting, if it were grounded on the Scriptures. It also voted an address to Pope Paul IV. demanding of the Council of Trent worship in the vernacular, communion in both forms, consecration of priests, abolition of the papal contributions, and the calling of a national council for the correction of abuses and the unification of church bodies. However, the king was weak. He sent the bishop of Przenysl as delegate; the diet was unrepresented and never accepted the resolutions of the council. King Sigismund August died in 1572 without heir, and unfortunately at this stage the country was thrown into the strife of electing a sovereign. The choice fell upon Prince Henry of Valois, duke of Anjou, who had been recommended by Coligny before Sigismund's death. In spite of the division, united action was taken at the Diet of Warsaw (1573) under the Reformed leadership of Crownmarshal Firley of Little Poland, guaranteeing equal rights and freedom to all creeds. The Reformed representatives of Poland also exacted a pledge from the king of France before they cast their votes for his brother, guaranteeing freedom of faith and worship and a safe return of the fugitives to his kingdom. Until the time of coronation the Jesuits plotted to make this oath void, and when Henry showed signs of weakening before reaffirming the oath at the coronation, Firley fearlessly stepped forward, seized the crown in his hand, and cried out in a loud voice, "If thou wilt not swear thou shalt not reign." The frightened king forthwith took the oath.

This episode was an outward mark of a Counter-Reformation which had been developing for some time. Two movements within the bosom of Protestantism exposed it the more to the reaction. First, antitrinitarianism, imported from Italy, toward which even Lismanin inclined, had its supporters and centered itself at Pinczow.

3. Counter-Reformation. Against this, Lasco (q.v.) placed himself in energetic and successful opposition. In the second place was the irreconcilable division of the three Protestant bodies over against the united front of the Jesuit Roman Catholics. The Church of Little Poland and Lithuania was Calvinistic; that of Greater Poland and Prussia, and, with occasions, that of Courland and Livonia, was Lutheran, the churches of which were early intermingled with many congregations of the Unity of the Brethren. Lasco strove for such a union with his last energy, but failed. Ten years after his death a general synod at Sendomir (1570) adopted a consensus identifying themselves in a union against the Roman Catholic Counter-Reformation. It was shaken by conflict as soon as it had been adopted. The general synod at Thorn (1595) reendorsed the consensus of Sendomir, making it binding upon all the clergy and subscriptions necessary under the penalty of dismission. Yet the measures fell into oblivion. In 1728 the general synod of Danzig recalled it from obscurity and resolved to adhere to it; but though never revoked, it was in time forgotten. Meanwhile the Counter-Reformation proceeded, conducted sagaciously by Rome, not only by availing of these internal divisions of Protestantism, but also by following its own independent designs, regardless of the survival of the Polish nation. The foreigner Stanislaus Hosius (q.v.), bishop of Ermland, was the leader and an irreconcilable antagonist of the dissidents. The Jesuits who worked by his side did perhaps nowhere else so effective and pernicious a work. While these laid their insidious plans in the houses of the nobles, Hosius knew how to make the most of the dissident polemical writings for the cause of Rome. A further aid was the papal nuncio at Cracow, Commendone, but most of all the king, Sigismund III. (1586–1632), called by contemporaries "king of the Jesuits." The Evangelicals lost their rights and liberty of conscience. The Jesuits also directed their efforts against the Eastern Church so that in 1599, at Wilna, a compact of Evangelicals and Greek adherents was made to which either side

made appeal from time to time until the final dismemberment of Poland. After a decade of warfare the Jesuits came out victorious, and the Evangelical cause and the kingdom went down together. Two centuries more, however, ensued before the victory was complete.

4. Later History.

The correspondence of Hosius reveals the return of the descendants of the illustrious fathers of the Reformation to Roman Catholicism. At an assembly in the palatinate of Cracow, in 1606, a warning call went up from the knighthood, referring to the compact, for the king to heed the senate; but the Protestant party was vanquished in that body, though at a diet in 1609, freedom from penalty and the right of legal appeal were obtained. The Jesuits continued their machinations; the king was wholly in their power, and in Cracow, Posen, Wilna, and elsewhere, they incited the populace and students to destroy the churches of the dissidents. At the close of Sigismund's reign, Poland was in rapid decline; the Jesuits had smothered the spiritual life and obtained complete possession of the schools; the people had lost a sense of their rights; and abroad the nation had fallen from its rank of influence. Wladislas IV. (1632–48), just and irenic, who called a colloquy at Thorn in 1645 looking toward the union of all churches, would not restrain the Jesuit activities. August II. (1696–1733) lent himself to their policies, having himself, as king of Saxony, apostatized to Roman Catholicism, in order to secure the throne of Poland. At the Diet of Grodno (1719) Casimir Ancuta, the Jesuit lawyer of Wilna, secured unlawfully the expulsion of the last dissident, Piotrowski. With the triumph of the Counter-Reformation is associated also the doom of the once glorious kingdom. The further history of Poland is involved in that of the countries among which its territory was divided.

(H. DALTON.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: On I. as sources consult: *Chronicæ Polonorum*, ed. J. Szlachtowski and R. Köpke, in *MGH, Script.*, ix (1851), pp. 423 sqq.; *Chronica Polonorum*, in Stenzel, *Scriptores rerum Silesiacarum*, vol. i., Cracow, 1872–88; *Acta historica res gestas Poloniæ illustrantia*, issued by the Cracow Academy, 1878 sqq.; Thietmar, *Chronicon*, most convenient in the ed. of F. Kurze, Hanover, 1889; *Monumenta Poloniæ historica*, 6 vols., Lwów, 1864–93. Consult further: C. G. Friese, *Kirchengeschichte des Königreichs Polen*, vol. i., Breslau, 1786; C. Meyer, *Geschichte des Landes Posen*, pp. 383 sqq., Posen, 1881; C. Schiemann, *Geschichte Polens*, Berlin, 1884–85; W. R. Morfill, *Poland*, London, 1893; W. P. Angerstein, *Der Konflikt des . . Boleslaus II. (1058–80) mit dem Bischof Stanislaus*, Thorn, 1895; K. S. Krotoski, *St. Stanislaw, Bishop Krakowski*, Torun, 1902; E. Schmidt, *Geschichte des Deutschtums im Lande Posen*, Bromberg, 1904; Hauck, *KD*, iii. 202–204, 272 sqq., 629 sqq. On II. consult: the literature under LASCO, JOHANNES A; *Acta conventus Thorun.*, Warsaw, 1646; D. E. Jablonski, *Hist. consensus Sendom.*, Berlin, 1731 (cf. H. Dalton, *D. E. Jablonski*, ib. 1903); C. G. Friese, ut sup., vols. ii.–iii.; S. Lubienski, *Historia reformationis Polonicæ*, Antwerp, 1685; C. V. Krasinski, *Hist. of Rise, Progress and Decline of the Polish Reformation*, 2 vols., London, 1838–40; idem, *Religious Hist. of the Slavonic Nations*, Edinburgh, 1851; J. Lukasiewitsch, *Die Reformation in Gross-Polen*, Darmstadt, 1843; G. W. T. Fischer, *Versuch einer Geschichte der Reformation in Polen*, 2 parts, Grätz, 1855–56; Schnaase, *Die bohmischen Brüder in Polen*, Gotha, 1866; J. Sembrzycki, *Die polnischen Reformirten und Unitarier in Preussen 1543*, Königsberg, 1893; E. Borgius, *Aus Posens und Polens kirchlicher Vergangenheit*, Berlin, 1898; O. Koniecki, *Geschichte der Reformation in Polen*, 2d ed., Posen, 1901; G. Krause, *Die Reformation in Polen*, Posen, 1901; Wotschke, *Andreas Samuel und Joh. Seklucyan*, Posen, 1902; K. Völker, *Der Protestantismus in Polen*, Leipsic, 1910; and the list of important periodical literature in Richardson, *Encyclopaedia*, p. 862.

POLANUS, VELERANDUS: Leader and pastor of Walloons in the middle of the sixteenth century. All that is known of him is that with Johannes a Lasco (q.v.) he led his congregation with two others from England, whither they had fled from the Netherlands, to settle at Frankfort. There he met the persistent opposition of Hartmann Beyer (q.v.) because of his adherence to the Reformed creed and polity, and was deprived of his church, while ultimately the right to hold service was forbidden to the congregation.

POLE (POOLE), REGINALD: English cardinal and statesman; b. at Stourton Castle (13 m. w. of Birmingham), Staffordshire, Mar., 1500; d. in Lambeth Palace, London, Nov. 17, 1558. On his mother's side he was of the blood royal, and, after his father's death, was educated by Henry VIII. In 1517 he obtained the benefice of Roscombe, which was supplemented by other benefices as he rose in the prelacy. In 1521 he went to Italy to complete his studies at Padua. In Paris, at the close of the third decade of the century, he was successful in obtaining an opinion from the University of Paris favorable to the king's divorce. He then returned to England to devote himself to theological studies in the cloister of Sheen. In 1531 he declined the proffered archbishopric of York, and in the following year he returned to Italy by way of Avignon. In Italy he lived a number of years in close friendship with Bembo, Contarini, Matteo Giberti, Alvise Priuli, and Giovanni Morone.

Life Previous to the Cardinalate.

Until 1535 Pole was regarded as neutral in the divorce question, and had received from England the incomes of his benefices. Now, however, the king demanded Pole's opinion in writing, and after considerable delay he complied in his *De unitate ecclesiæ*, which brought about a total change in his position, since he became a decided partizan of the opposition. The king demanded that Pole should give an explanation of his treatise in person, but at this juncture he was called to Rome by Paul III., chiefly to take part in preparing the *Consilium de emendanda ecclesia*.

Pole was created cardinal of Santa Maria in Cosmedin on Dec. 22, 1536, and now wrote an *Apologia ad Angliæ Parlamentum*, firm in substance, but moderate in tone. In 1537 he was sent by Paul III. as legate to the Netherlands, whence he was to fan the insurrection in England. The rebellion, however, was crushed, and the king declared Pole guilty of high treason. The cardinal now left the Netherlands, but neither the emperor nor Francis I. would receive him, and it was only in Italy that he felt safe. But the pope rehabilitated him by again employing him as legate, this time to the emperor; but his family in England suffered heavily, for Henry arrested the cardinal's brothers and mother, and when the younger brother gave evi-

Pole as Cardinal.

dence against the others, they were brought to the scaffold. Meanwhile, in 1541, Pole had been appointed legate of the patrimony, i.e., governor of the Papal States, and was thus led to fix his residence at Viterbo. There certain colloquies on religious questions were held, the participants including Vittoria Colonna, Pietro Carnesecchi, and Marco Antonio Flaminio. These discussions, however, were afterward deemed heretical by the Inquisition, because both the point of departure and the mainstay of the argument lay in the doctrine of justification by faith, the merit of good works being excluded.

After the death of Edward VI., Pole, in 1554, again beheld his native land, this time as papal legate. He found Queen Mary already married to Philip II., and the reaction in full swing. He took active part in the work and urged the enforcement of the stern ancient laws against the Protestants. But all his zeal could not induce his enemy, Giovanni Pietro Caraffa, who, in 1555, ascended the papal throne as Paul IV (q.v.), to forget that Pole himself was at one time under suspicion of heresy. The new pontiff recalled the English legation, and summoned Pole before the tribunal of the Holy Office in Rome. Only his procrastination, and then his death, delivered him from appearing there.

K. Benrath.

Bibliography: Among the works of Pole the following are most significant: *Ad Henricum Octavum Brittaniæ regem, Pro ecclesiasticæ unitatis defensione*, Rome, 1554 (extract in English, *The seditious and blasphemous Oration of Cardinal Pole, . . Translated . . by Fabyane Wythers*, London, 1560); *De concilio*, Venice, 1562; *De summo pontifice Christi in terris vicario*, Louvain, 1569; *Reformatio Angliæ*, London, 1556; *A Treatise of Justification*, Louvain, 1569.

The one authoritative life was written in Italian by Beccatelli, Lat. transl. by A. Dudith, found in Ital. and Lat. in *Epistolæ Reginaldi Poli*, 5 vols., 1744–57, an Eng. transl. is by P. Pye, London, 1760. A life still worth consulting is that in English by T. Phillips, Oxford, 1764. Consult further: the anonymous life prefixed to *Christ. Longolii Orationes, Epistolæ et Vita*, Florence, 1524; W. F. Hook, *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*, vol. viii., London, 1869; N. Pocock, *Records of the Reformation*, 2 vols., Oxford, 1870 (contains original documents); N. Sander, *Rise and Growth of the Anglican Schism*, London, 1877 (Roman Catholic); F. G. Lee, *Reginald Pole . . an historical Sketch*, London, 1888 (deals only with the beginning and end of the cardinal's career); A. Zimmerman, *Kardinal Pole, Sein Leben und seine Schriften*, Regensburg, 1893 (accurate); W. Clark, *The Anglican Reformation*, New York, 1897; F. A. Gasquet, *Henry VIII. and the English Monasteries*, London, 1899; J. Gairdner, *The English Church in the Sixteenth Century*, London, 1903 (many details); *Cambridge Modern History*, vol. ii. passim, Cambridge, 1903; C. M. Antony, *The Angelical Cardinal Reginald Pole*, London, 1909; M. Haile, *Life of Reginald Pole*, London and New York, 1910; J. Gillow, *Biographical Dictionary of English Catholics*, v. 336–341, London, n.d.; *DNB*, xlvi. 35–46.

POLEMICS.

Nature, Place, and Function (§ 1).
Pre-Reformation and Roman Catholic Polemics (§ 2).
Protestant Polemics (§ 3).
The Modern Phase (§ 4).
In Great Britain and America (§ 5).

Polemics is that department of theology which is concerned with the history of controversies maintained within or by the Christian Church, and with the conducting of such controversies in defense of doctrines held to be essential to Christian truth or in support of distinctive denominational tenets. It is, however, a question whether polemics belongs to the special departments of dogmatics, ethics, or practical theology, or whether it constitutes an independent branch of study. Christianity has had, from the first, to battle with scientific weapons against Jews, heathens, heretics, and schismatics, so that a rich and varied controversial literature was early developed in all branches of theology; though the means and the methods have varied according to the nature of the subject under discussion and the persons engaged.

1. Nature, Place, and Function.

Theoretically there is no distinct department of theological polemics; but practically there is a very real need of an independent branch of this nature. Theological polemics, therefore, scientifically combats erroneous conceptions and mistaken attitudes toward Christianity in its various phases, with the aim of defending the position of the communion to which the controversialist belongs. As the ancient Church had to fight against the classes of opponents already named, so modern polemics must defend the spirit of Christianity against non-Christian philosophies, sectarianism, indifferentism, and separatism. The problem next arises as to what place is occupied by polemics in the general field of theology. Schleiermacher divided theology into "philosophical," "historical," and "practical," and subdivided "philosophical theology" into "polemics" and "apologetics," apologetics being directed outwardly, and polemics inwardly. This division, however, is unsatisfactory. In the first place, polemics is applied dogmatics, for the polemic starts with certain dogmatic presuppositions. Again, it is applied symbolics, since dogmatic conceptions develop best in the orderly growth of a communion fully conscious of its distinctive organization. Theologically, therefore, polemics finds a place after dogmatics and apologetics. If, in addition to questions of doctrine, it takes into consideration the conduct of life, it becomes related to ethics, and may extend to organization and law, as well as to liturgics, missions, science, and art. The limits of the subject depend upon practical circumstances, the needs of the period, and the disposition of the controversialist.

2. Pre-Reformation and Roman Catholic Polemics.

False doctrines were combated by the apostles, and the Church Fathers followed along the same lines, so that polemic literature has existed since the time of Justin Martyr (q.v.), though his work "Against all Heresies" has been lost. Extant polemic literature begins with the "Against Heresies" of Irenæus (q.v.). The *Apologeticum* and *De præscriptione hæreticorum* of Tertullian (q.v.) followed; and Hippolytus (q.v.) continued in the third century with his work on heresies. The dogmatic theology of the Greek Church was strongly polemic from the fourth to the eighth century; and during the same period the theology of the west assumed a polemic character through its strife with Donatism, Pelagianism, Semipelagianism, and Manicheism, a large number of Augustine's writings being of this character. The polemic literature of the Middle Ages against heretics, Jews,

and philosophical freethinkers was dogmatic in character from Agobard of Lyons to Savonarola's *Triumphus crucis*. Then came, in the sixteenth century, the controversy between Roman Catholicism and Protestantism. The writings of the Jesuits especially were polemic. Alfonso de Castro wrote *Adversus omnes hæresc libri quatuordecim* (Paris, 1534), being followed by Franciscus Coster's *Enchiridion controversiarum* (Cologne, 1585) and Gregorius de Valentia's *De rebus fidei hoc tempore controversis* (1591). The chief work here, however, was the *Disputationes de controversiis Christianæ fidei* (3 vols., Rome, 1581–91) of Bellarmine (q.v.), who was followed by Martin Becan (d. 1624) with his *Manuale controversiarum hujus temporis* (Mainz, 1623). Jesuit polemics against Protestantism have continued without intermission, one of the most noteworthy works of this character in recent years being the *Il Protestantesimo e la regola di fede* (3 vols., Rome, 1853) of G. Perrone (q.v.). More popular circles had already been reached by Bossuet' *Exposition de la doctrine de l'église catholique sur les matières de controverse* (Paris, 1671).

3. Protestant Polemics.

The Protestants, in their turn, were no less active polemically from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century. Here special mention may be made of Martin Chemnitz, *Examen concilii Tridentini* (Frankfort, 1565); Konrad Schlüsselburg, *Hæreticorum catalogus* (1597–99); Nicolaus Hunnius (d. 1643), *Diaskepsis de fundamentali dissensu doctrinæ Lutheranæ et Calvinianæ* (Wittenberg, 1616); Abraham Calovius, *Synopsis controversiarum* (1685); and Johann Georg Walch, *Einleitung in die polemische Gottesgelehrtheit* (Jena, 1752). Interest in polemics ceased with Friedrich Samuel Bock's *Lehrbuch für die neueste Polemik* (1782). In the Reformed wing mention should be made of Rudolf Hospinian, *Concordia discors* (Zurich, 1607); Daniel Chanier, *Panstratia catholica* (4 vols., Geneva, 1626); Johann Hoornbeck, *Summa controversiarum* (Utrecht, 1653); Francesco Turretini, *Institutio theologiæ elenchticæ* (Geneva, 1681–85); and various writings of Friedrich Spanheim, the elder and the younger (qq.v.).

4. The Modern Phase.

Polemics entered upon a new phase with Schleiermacher, whose classification of polemics among the branches of theology has already been described. He was followed by Karl Heinrich Sack, with his *Christliche Polemik* (Hamburg, 1838), who defined polemics as that branch of theology which detects and refutes errors that endanger Christian faith and the purity of the Christian Church; and by Johann Peter Lange, whose *Christliche Dogmatik* (3 parts, Heidelberg, 1849–52) calls polemics and irenics "applied dogmatics." Theoretically, since the middle of the nineteenth century, polemics has not been regarded as a distinct department of theology. Practically, however, a new era in polemics was begun by the sharp critiques of Protestantism by Roman Catholic scholars of recent times. This movement was inaugurated by Johann Adam Möhler's *Symbolik* (Mainz, 1832), essentially a polemic against Protestantism from an idealistic Roman Catholic point of view; and this work was followed by the great historical polemic of Johann Joseph Ignaz von Döllinger, *Die Reformation, ihre innere Entwickelung und ihre Wirkungen* (3 vols., Regensburg, 1846–48). The ultramontane spirit there displayed was equally manifest in Johannes Janssen's *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters* (8 vols., Freiburg, 1877–94; Eng. transl., *Hist. of the German People*, 12 vols., St. Louis, 1896–1907), and Heinrich Suso Denifle's *Luther und Luthertum in der ersten Entwickelung* (2 vols., Mainz, 1904–10). The Protestants replied vigorously to these attacks with Ferdinand Christian Baur's *Gegensatz des Katholicismus und Protestantismus nach den Prinzipien und Hauptdogmen der beiden Lehrbegriffe* (Tübingen, 1834), Carl Immanuel Nitzsch's *Protestantische Beantwortung der Symbolik Dr. Möhlers* (Hamburg, 1835), and a number of other works. While the books just mentioned are necessarily limited in scope, a thoroughgoing, though purely negative, discussion of the chief points of difference between Roman Catholicism and Protestantism was supplied by Karl August von Hase's *Handbuch der protestantischen Polemik gegen die römisch-katholische Kirche* (Leipsic, 1862, 7th ed., 1900, Eng. transl., London, 1906) which discusses the Church (clergy and papacy), salvation (faith, works, sacraments), and accessories (ritual, art, science, literature, politics, nationality). Paul Tschackert followed this with his *Evangelische Polemik gegen die römische Kirche* (Gotha, 1885; 2d ed., 1888), which not only criticizes the Roman Catholic system in detail, but also affords a substitute for each point criticized by presenting the Protestant teaching on the tenet in question. Finally, mention should be made of the anti-Roman Catholic propaganda carried on by the *Schriften des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte* (Halle, 1883 sqq.) and by the Evangelischer Bund zur Wahrung der deutsch-protestantischen Interessen (founded in 1886). (Paul Tschackert.)

5. In Great Britain and America.

In Great Britain and America polemics has taken a different course from that which it assumed on the continent. Several causes have contributed to this. Theological encyclopedia has been far less exact in its divisions, and where polemics has not been recognized as a separate discipline, it has been incorporated into the body of theological construction. There has, moreover, been but little interest in the history of this branch of theological discussion. Again, toleration has been a marked feature of English and American religious thought (cf. Milton, *Areopagitica;* and Jeremy Taylor, *Liberty of Prophecying*, which unfortunately he did not exemplify later). Still further, the edge of the controversial spirit has been dulled by the practical nature of the Anglo-Saxon mind, the disposition to compromise, the lack of thoroughgoing intellectual consistency, together with a rationalizing tendency which has tempered criticism of the positions of others. Polemics has appeared quite as often in apologetics as in doctrinal discussions. Only a few of the historical occasions of polemics and names of the chief persons involved are here indicated. (1) The deistic controversy (1648–1775; see Deism), in which among the pamphleteers and

dignified defenders of supernatural religion appear Richard Bentley (q.v.), *Remarks upon a Late Discourse of Free Thinking* (London, 1713), a reply to Anthony Collins, *Discourse of Free Thinking* (ib. 1713); Thomas Sherlock, *Trial of the Witnesses of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ* (ib. 1729), against Woolsen, *Discourse on Miracles* (ib. 1727–29); and W. Warburton, *Divine Legation of Moses* (ib., vol. i., 1737–38, vol. ii., 1741). (2) Against the Arminians—also including the Arians—of whom were Daniel Whitby, *Discourse concerning Election and Reprobation* (ib. 1710); Samuel Clarke, *Boyle Lectures*, 1704–05, and *Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity* (ib. 1712); and John Taylor, *The Scripture Doctrine of Original Sin* (ib. 1740), which gave rise to many rejoinders by D. Waterland (cf. *Works*, vol. i. "Life" by Van Mildert, Oxford, 1823) and others in Great Britain, and in New England by Jonathan Edwards (q.v.), *Inquiry into the Freedom of the Will* (Boston, 1754). (3) The Unitarian controversy in NewEngland was ushered in by the election of Henry Ware as Hollis professor of divinity in Harvard College in 1805. The principal writers from the side of orthodoxy were Moses Stuart (q.v.), professor of sacred literature in Andover Theological Seminary, *Letters to Rev. William E. Channing, D.D., on the Divinity of Christ* (Andover, 1819); Samuel Worcester, *Letters to Rev. Dr. William E. Channing* (three pamphlets, Boston, 1815); and Leonard Woods (q.v.), also professor in Andover, *Letters to Unitarians* (Andover, 1820), *Reply to Dr. Ware's Letters to Trinitarians and Calvinists* (ib. 1821), and *Remarks on Dr. Ware's Answer* (ib. 1822). (4) The Tractarian Movement in Great Britain (1833–41; see TRACTARIANISM), brought to a crisis by John Henry Newman's *Tract No. 90*, provoked a steadily rising storm of opposition first from the *Christian Observer* (Mar., 1834), and at last from Archibald Campbell Tait (Archbishop of Canterbury, 1868–1882) who, with three other Oxford tutors, signed a protest against Newman's tract. Owing to the violent controversy which ensued the series was "discontinued." (5) The Liberal Movement in the established church centered in Frederick Denison Maurice (q.v.), whose *Theological Lectures* (ib. 1853) was vehemently opposed by R. W Jelf, principal of King's College; and by Henry Mansel, *Man's Conception of Eternity* (ib. 1854); Maurice's *What is Revelation?* (ib. 1859) was subjected to severe criticism by Mansel's *Examination of the Strictures on the Bampton Lectures, 1858* (ib. 1859). (6) In America the (N. W.) Taylor- (Bennet) Tyler controversy (see NEW ENGLAND THEOLOGY) involved the questions of depravity, the self-determining power of the will, regeneration, and the divine permission of sin. (For Taylor, cf. *The Quarterly Christian Spectator*, New Haven, 1832–1833; also, G. P Fisher, *Discussions in History and Theology*, New York, 1880. For Tyler, cf. *The Spirit of the Pilgrims*, Boston, 1832–33; also, *Letters on the New Haven Theology*, ib. 1837.) (7) In 1835–1837 there culminated in the Presbyterian Church a heated discussion, in which a fierce attack was made upon Albert Barnes and Lyman Beecher, occasioned by their view of the atonement and related subjects. (8) In the latter part of the last century (1882–93) the so-called "Andover heresy," originating in a chapter in *Progressive Orthodoxy* (Boston, 1886), advocated probation after death for those who had been deprived of probation in this life. The controversy focused on the policy of the A. B. C. F. M., whether those who maintained this view were eligible to appointment as missionaries of the board. It was permanently settled in 1893 by instructions to the Prudential Committee to commission one who held to this position. It is possibly significant that Andover Theological Seminary, which was founded in part to combat Unitarianism among other heresies, celebrated its centennial, 1908, by affiliation with the Harvard Divinity School whose history had been identified with the Unitarian body.

C. A. BECKWITH.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: G. B. Crooks and J. F. Hurst, *Theological Encyclopædia and Methodology*, pp. 437 sqq., New York, 1894; P. Schaff, *Theological Propædeutic*, pp. 411–412, ib. 1904; J. B. Röhm, *Protestantische Polemik*, Hildesheim, 1882; W. G. T. Shedd, *Dogmatic Theology*, i. 15, New York, 1891; S. J. Hunter, *Outlines of Dogmatic Theology*, 6, 84, ib. 1894; A. Cave, *Introduction to Theology*, pp. 521 sqq., Edinburgh, 1896; L. Emery, *Introduction à l'étude de la théologie protestante*, pp. 182–183, Paris, 1904; and the literature under THEOLOGY AS A SCIENCE.

POLENZ, GEORGE OF. See GEORGE OF POLENZ.

POLIANDER, JOHANNES (JOHANN GRAMANN, GRAUMANN): German Reformer; b. at Neustadt-on-the-Main (42 m. s.e. of Frankfort) July 5, 1487; d. at Königsberg Apr. 29, 1541. Educated at the University of Leipsic (B.A., 1506; M.A., 1516), he was first teacher and then rector at the Thomasschule in the same city. In 1519 he acted as amanuensis of Eck at his disputation with Luther and Carlstadt, and in consequence of Luther's argument he went to the University of Wittenberg in the autumn of the same year, where he was intimately associated with Luther and Melanchthon. Returning to Leipsic in the following year, he lectured on the Bible on the Wittenberg model. His success as a scholar and teacher brought Conrad, bishop of Würzburg, to cause his appointment as cathedral preacher at Würzburg in 1522, where he came into conflict, in 1524, with the monastic preachers because of his views on the veneration of the saints with the result that he was relieved of his position. He was then preacher to the Poor Clares (see CLARE, SAINT, AND THE POOR CLARES) at Nuremberg and preacher at Mansfeld. In 1525 he accepted the call of Duke Albrecht of Prussia to Königsberg, where he became pastor of the Altstadt, and together with his friends Paul Speratus and Johann Briesmann (qq.v.), the two other "evangelists of the Prussians," he established Protestant foundations in Prussia. Besides preaching he lectured publicly on the Bible. He also composed "Nun lob mein Seel den Herren" and probably the "Fröhlich muss ich singen," thus being one of the first Protestant hymn-writers. It is probable that he took part in compiling the first two collections of Protestant hymns for Königsberg (1527). In consequence of his pedagogical experience, Albrecht entrusted him with the organization of the new Protestant schools; and in 1531 he was one of

the general ecclesiastical visitors who divided the country into parishes, regulated the income of the ministers and the new ecclesiastical conditions. At the same time he was active in combating the sectaries brought from Silesia by Schwenckfeld. At the colloquy of Rastenburg in 1531 Poliander was the decisive factor in the victory over the Anabaptists. Until his death he stood in intimate relations of counselor and friend with Albrecht.

(David Erdmann†.)

Bibliography: For sources consult: T. Kolde, in *Beiträge zur bayerischen Kirchengeschichte*, vol. vi., parts 2 and 5, Erlangen, 1899; P. Tschackert, *Publikationen aus den königl. preuss. Staatsarchiven*, vols. xliii.–xlv., Leipsic, 1890–91. Consult further: F. W. E. Rost, *Memoria Poliandri*, Leipsic, 1808; idem, *Was hat die Leipziger Thomasschule für die Reformation gethan?* ib. 1817; J. C. Cosack, *P. Speratus Leben und Lieder*, pp. 77 sqq., Brunswick, 1861.

POLITI, LANCELOTTI. See Catharinus, Ambrosius.

POLITY, ECCLESIASTICAL.*

I. Introduction.
II. Monarchical Type (Roman Catholicism).
Papal Authority Absolute (§ 1).
Roman Doctrine of Church and State (§ 2).
III. Aristocratic Type (Eastern Church).
IV. Consistorial Type (Lutheran).
Luther's Doctrine of the Church (§ 1).
The Prince and the Consistory (§ 2).
V. Episcopal Type (Church of England, Protestant Episcopal Church).
VI. Presbyterian Type.
Rise and Extension (§ 1).
Divine Right; Characteristics (§ 2).
VII. Congregational Type.
Distribution (§ 1).
Essentials; Divine Right; Church and State (§ 2).
VIII. Eclectic Types (Methodist Churches).
Constituent Elements (§ 1).
Resultant Forms of Government (§ 2).
IX. Conclusion.

I. Introduction: The emphasis in this discussion falls upon the developments which have occurred within the modern period, and upon the grounds of induction relative to the probable future of a church polity which are supplied by these developments. The Roman and Greek types in their pre-Reformation form were the product of a lengthened historical evolution, and only by sweeping dogmatic assumptions can they be identified with the primitive constitution of the Church. Some germs of them doubtless were on hand at an early date, but as they appeared at the opening of the sixteenth century they were remote from anything that was outlined by Christ or known to his immediate followers. It is to be noted that, while forms of polity may appropriately be named after certain leading characteristics, they are not likely to be adequately described by the titles thus affixed. In a theoretical point of view it makes a great difference whether a given polity is supposed to subsist by divine right, or simply on the basis of human discretion. Practically it is of large account whether a given polity is operated independently, or in close connection with the State. Furthermore, it is of consequence in judging a given polity to observe whether it is appreciably modified by the incorporation of some element from a different type. The subject is obviously one of great complexity.

II. Monarchical Type (Roman Catholicism): Since the promulgation of the decrees of the Vatican Council (q.v.) and the acceptance of those decrees as having ecumenical authority, it can not be denied that the constitution of the Roman Catholic Church is emphatically monarchical. Prior to the Vatican legislation it was permissible to assume that in the general body of the episcopate there resided an authority at least coordinate with that of the pope. This assumption was widely current in the early part of the nineteenth century. But reaction from the disintegrating work of the French Revolution, powerfully seconded by pope and Curia, prepared for the enthronement of the opposing ultramontane theory. This result was consummated at the Vatican Council. The two decrees of that council relative to the papal office —the one declaring that the pope possesses the fulness of the supreme power of jurisdiction over the universal Church, together with the right of immediate exercise of it over all the faithful, and the other asserting his independent infallibility—together constitute a formidable declaration of undivided and irresponsible rule. In the light of these decrees one may express the outcome in the equation: In point of authority the pope plus the Church equals the pope minus the Church. As complete in itself and exempt from all lawful restriction or arrest, the authority of the pope rules out the very notion of a supplement. Roman apologists, it is true, disclaim the application of the term "absolute" to the papal monarchy. By divine ordinance, they say, bishops have a place in ecclesiastical administration. The pope is bound by this fixed element in the constitution. Furthermore, he is bound by the *ex cathedra* decrees of his predecessors on matters of faith and morals. Consequently, the papal monarchy is not of the absolutist type. But while the pope must consent to the existence of bishops, no bishop can enter upon his office without the permission of the pope, from whom, or through whom, comes all power of jurisdiction, and who has also the right either to appoint bishops or to determine the mode of their appointment. No bishop in office can go counter to the expressed will of the pope without being guilty of a misdemeanor. No bishop can remain in office against the will of the pope. No council of bishops can be assembled contrary to the will of the pope, and no assembled council can pass any authoritative decree against his judgment. As respects the *ex cathedra* decrees of predecessors the pope alone interprets them with full authority, and no one has the legal pre-

1. Papal Authority Absolute.

* In connection with the following treatment the reader should consult the articles on the various churches and denominational bodies of which mention is made in the course of the discussion, which articles usually contain accounts of the principles and the details of church government prevailing within the several bodies. See also such articles as Church, the Christian; Church Government; Church and State; Collegialism; Territorialism; Bishop; Deacon; Episcopacy; and Organization of the Early Church.

rogative to gainsay his interpretation. The pope is absolute in the same sense in which the divine head would be absolute if visibly enthroned over the militant Church. Roman orthodoxy accepts in their full significance these words of Palmieri, "The jurisdiction of the Roman pontiff is the vicarial jurisdiction of Christ."

2. Roman Doctrine of Church and State.

Roman Catholic deliverances in recent times on the proper relation between Church and State show a very scanty abatement from the medieval platform (see CHURCH AND STATE, §§ 3–6). The separation of Church and State is declared to be abnormal. The most that is conceded is that the scheme of separation can be condoned for the time being where the conditions are such as to make it practically necessary. "The Church," says Philipp Hergenröther, "rejects on principle the system of the separation of Church and State"; and in saying this he but expresses the plain import of the Syllabus of Errors of Pius IX., the encyclical on the Christian Constitution of States of Leo XIII., and the encyclical *Pascendi gregis* of Pius X. Recent teaching promulgated by pontiffs, canonists, and theologians pronounces that Church and State are not related as equals, but that the Church, as representing the supernatural order and being the infallible guardian of morals, has a preeminence of rightful authority. The authority of the Church, it should be observed in this connection, means the authority of the hierarchy. As Phillips wrote near the middle of the last century, "the clergy is the sanctifying, the teaching, the ruling Church; the laity is the Church to be sanctified, to be taught, to be ruled." Very recently Pius X. in his encyclical against Modernism (q.v.) has strongly emphasized this sentiment by classing among reprehensible errors the contention that a "share in ecclesiastical government should be given to the lower ranks of the clergy and even to the laity," and by ordaining, as a condition of the assembling of congresses of priests, "that absolutely nothing be said in them that savors of Modernism, Presbyterianism, or Laicism." Herein the pontiff undoubtedly speaks in perfect conformity to the postulates of the Roman system.

In the practical exercise of ecclesiastical sovereignty the Roman Congregations constitute an important factor. At a recent date they numbered nineteen. The scheme of reorganization put forth by Pius X. in 1908 provided for reducing them to eleven.

III. Aristocratic Type (Eastern Church): In one point of view it is more appropriate to speak of the Orthodox Eastern Churches than of the Orthodox Eastern Church (see EASTERN CHURCH, I.). While those who claim the title of "Orthodox" hold a common creed, make use of the same liturgy, and acknowledge bonds of intercommunion, they constitute in respect of government a number of independent bodies (in 1907, sixteen, namely, the churches of the four patriarchates of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem; the national churches of Russia, Greece, Servia, Montenegro, Roumania, and Bulgaria; the church of Cyprus; the churches of Carlowitz, Hermannstadt, Czernowitz, and Bosnia-Herzegovina within the Austro-Hungarian monarchy; the monastery of Mount Sinai). The model of church constitution which the Orthodox Eastern Church brought down to the modern period was that recognized by the ecumenical councils of the fourth and following centuries, which knows no ecclesiastical monarch. The highest dignitaries are patriarchs set over the major provinces of the Christian world. The sole legitimate authority standing above them is the ecumenical council. Among the patriarchs of the eastern division the one resident at Constantinople was understood to be vested by conciliar decrees, especially those of Chalcedon, with a certain primacy. Mohammedan conquests interfered not a little with the working of the patriarchal constitution, but in its general framework it survived to the modern era. The power which has wrought most effectively to modify this constitution has been the example and the influence of Russia. Since more than four-fifths of the entire membership of the Orthodox Eastern Church is included within that empire, naturally the ecclesiastical scheme espoused and supported by Russia claims the right of way. The Russian state has eliminated within its territory the jurisdiction of an outside party like the patriarch of Constantinople. In 1589 it instituted the patriarchal office at Moscow. In 1721 it did away with the patriarchate and organized the Holy Synod (made up now of eight or nine bishops with the addition of two priests) to serve as the supreme ecclesiastical authority, being entrusted with oversight of doctrine, worship, and matters of administration. Again, the policy of the Russian state was to keep a firm hand upon the management of church affairs. And this is done through provisions which secure that the Holy Synod shall not antagonize the will of the sovereign. The czar appoints a part of the members and controls in no small degree the selection of the rest. In the meetings of the synod he is represented by a lay official styled the chief procurator. The Russian code recognizes him as the overlord in preserving good order in the Church and directing its legislation. While he is not credited with power to make dogmas, it falls within his prerogative to bring measures before the synod, and the conclusions of that body are subject to his judgment. In Greece and the other national churches in the domain of Eastern Orthodoxy both of these features—the independent relation to the patriarch at Constantinople and the prominence of State authority—the Russian model is largely followed. In all the branches of the Eastern Church the former feature is exemplified. Outside of his patriarchate proper in European Turkey and Asia Minor the patriarch of Constantinople enjoys at most some trivial tokens of an honorary primacy.

The hierarchy of the Orthodox Eastern Church is not widely distinguished as to its enumeration of ranks from the Roman Catholic, except that it stops short of monarchy. It includes patriarchs, metropolitan bishops, ordinary bishops, priests, and deacons. Below the deacon are the four minor orders of subdeacon, reader, exorcist, and doorkeeper. A distinguishing feature is that the title "metropolitan" is in most instances simply honor-

ary. Only a few metropolitans have suffragans. Another point of contrast with the Roman system is that the diaconate is not treated as a mere stepping-stone to the priesthood. Many deacons remain such all their lives and serve as curates in the parishes.

IV. Consistorial Type (Lutheran): While divine right is claimed both in Roman Catholic and in Orthodox Eastern theory for prominent features of the hierarchical system, Luther repudiated the notion of the *jus divinum* in the domain of church polity. He was disposed to regard polity as resting upon human election, and having its sanction in practical demands. It was contrary to his emphasis on the universal priesthood of believers to exalt the pastor over the congregation as either a necessary medium of grace or embodiment of sovereignty. Aptness to teach he rated as the great pastoral credential, and the ministration of Word and sacrament as the great pastoral function. Ordination meant for him simply a solemn public recognition of ministerial standing. On these points—the optional character of church polity and the non-sacerdotal standing of the Christian minister—Luther supplied a permanent standard to his followers (see CHURCH, THE CHRISTIAN, IV., § 2; LUTHER, MARTIN, §§ 6, 14). With his stress upon the primacy of the Evangelical message in the Church Luther could easily have reconciled himself to any form of external arrangements compatible with normal opportunity for that message. He had no objection to episcopacy as such. Had a larger proportion of the bishops been friendly to the Evangelical movement, episcopacy might have had a fair chance to survive in the Lutheran domain. As it was, it maintained only a transient existence in any part of Germany. The Scandinavian countries took an exceptional course in uniting Lutheranism with the episcopal form of administration.

1. Luther's Doctrine of the Church.

It was not long before Luther's somewhat idealized conception of the Church as essentially a teaching institute, governing and molding men by the power of the Word, submitted to practical modification under the pressure of circumstances. The disturbances wrought by the Peasants' War, the ignorance and wildness of the people, and the readiness of the nobles to make spoil of church property emphasized the need of a directing and disciplining power. The one power available for the exigency seemed to be the Evangelical prince, the secular ruler who had espoused the Reformation. So he stepped into the position of control, and theory was speedily accommodated to his actual standing by his being rated as heir, within his own territory, to the old episcopal authority. The resulting type of polity was distinctly Erastian. The government of the Church became very largely a matter of territorial sovereignty. The prince was not indeed expected to assume the spiritual office of administering the Word and the sacraments, but in the general ecclesiastical management he was accorded a preeminent function. The foremost organ of administration, under the temporal ruler, came at an early stage to be the consistory. Composed of theologians and jurists appointed by the State this body served as a constant tribunal to pass on disputed points of administration, to supervise property and educational interests, and to render judgment in the major cases of discipline. In the next grade of official importance came the superintendents, who were usually pastors, selected by the secular government to exercise a species of oversight over neighboring pastors. In the settlement of the pastors the deciding voice belonged to the State and to the local patron. The prerogative of the congregation was usually limited to the right of objecting to a presented candidate. The development, on the whole, may be described as being toward an emphatic preponderance of State authority, it being understood that the consistory was very largely the instrument of the State. Such germs of presbyterial or synodal organization as were witnessed by the first generations of Lutherans were in no wise fostered and brought to maturity.

2. The Prince and the Consistory.

A serious and partially effective attempt to modify this consistorial polity was first made in the latter part of the nineteenth century. An incentive in this direction was derived from the wide-spread movement toward the principle of constitutional rule which was started in 1848. Enlarged prerogative on the part of the general body of citizens naturally suggested enlarged privilege on the part of the membership in the government of the Church. The result was an extension of the rights of the local congregation in the management of its own affairs, and the granting of more or less important functions to representative bodies or synods meeting at stated intervals.

V. Episcopal Type (Church of England, Protestant Episcopal Church): Among the communions which emerged from the Reformation movement the Established Church of England was specially distinguished by the extent to which it conserved the medieval polity. It retained the hierarchical constitution, only cutting off the papacy at one end of the official line and the orders below the diaconate at the other end. Also in the scheme for the parishes, the cathedral chapters, and such aids to diocesan administration as archdeacons and rural deans much of the old system was retained. It is noticeable, however, that English Churchmen did not in the earlier period claim divine right, or exclusive validity, for their polity as against that of other Protestant communions. The statements of such eminent representatives as Jewel, Hooker, and Whitgift amount to a disclaiming of that right. The wide currency which is now accorded to the theory of a necessary episcopal organization and apostolical succession is attributable in large part to Laud and other Carolinian divines, to the Nonjurors (q.v.), and to the Tractarians (see TRACTARIANISM). The royal "supremacy" over the Church of England as originally asserted in the reign of Henry VIII. included a full complement of substantial prerogatives. In the succeeding period also, so long as the Court of High Commission subsisted, the sovereign was capable of interposing very efficiently in the management of the Church. For

the most part since the revolution of 1688 the royal supremacy has signified little else than a chief share in dispensing ecclesiastical dignities. As for the lay body in general, outside of the function of parliament in relation to the establishment, it has had very scanty recognition in the plan of government of the Church of England. It has been wholly shut out from the houses of convocation (q.v.), which however cannot perform any real work of ecclesiastical government without being favored with "letters of business" from the sovereign. In the view of not a few thoroughly devoted members of the Church of England the situation calls for remedy. It is urged that in order to be inspired with due interest in the Church laymen must be associated with the clergy in the management of affairs in parish councils, diocesan councils, and the houses of convocation. Only when the lay element comes to this measure of recognition, it is argued, will the nation have any disposition to grant the Church due autonomy by enlarging the prerogatives of its own proper assemblies. This feature has become well-established in the daughter communions. In the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States the laity has been represented from the start in the house of deputies, which, with the coordinate house of bishops, forms the General Convention, which constitutes the highest legislative authority in that Church (see PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH). Laymen have seats also in the diocesan conventions with equal right of voice and vote. Usually laymen help to make up the diocesan committee which serves the bishop as an advisory body; they have also a large function in the settling of pastors and in determining the period of their incumbency. Thus in the polity of this communion episcopalianism has been united with a considerable Presbyterian element. Partly owing to the influence of this American example a similar polity has gained wide currency in the churches affiliated with the Church of England. Laymen have been members of the governing assemblies of the Episcopal Church of Ireland since 1871. The same has been true of the Scottish Episcopal Church since the revision of its constitution in 1876. The principal colonial churches—in Canada, South Africa, and Australia—as they enjoy practical autonomy have adopted in like manner the plan of governing assemblies composed jointly of clergy and laity.

VI. Presbyterian Type: This form of polity, which received its initial impulse from Calvin and the Genevan model, was represented before the end of the sixteenth century in Poland, various parts of Germany, Holland, France, and Scotland, and gained a standing later as an appreciable factor throughout the English-speaking world. The Calvinian conception of the Church from which the Presbyterian type proceeded has some points of distinction from the original Lutheran conception. In the former a less exclusive stress was placed upon the Church as a channel of grace through the saving ministry of the Word. Prominence was also given to the office of the Church as an instrument for promoting the rule of God in the world. Proceeding from this standpoint, the Calvinian communions naturally made larger account of discipline than did the Lutheran, and were somewhat more ready to carry a militant spirit into their religion. The training of the elect to give practical effect to God's sovereign right was relatively a conspicuous feature in their ecclesiastical scheme. In the Calvinian theory State and Church were rated as coordinate powers, having each its own province. The extent of the alliance which might be consummated between them was regarded as determined by the possibilities of mutual serviceableness. At Geneva Calvin thought it appropriate to give considerable scope to the prerogatives of the State in ecclesiastical management as being best suited to achieve the aim of the Church, the practical rule of God over the community. In Holland also Presbyterianism made connection with the State, and in Scotland it has held the status of an "established" religion. It received legal establishment in England under the Long Parliament, but did not have opportunity to enter largely into the standing assigned in the legislation. Generally, a rather jealous attitude toward State interference has been characteristic of Presbyterian bodies. In the American version of the Westminster Confession the legitimate function of civil magistrates in relation to ecclesiastical matters is defined to be the impartial protection of all denominations of Christians.

1. Rise and Extension.

The claim of divine right for their polity has had considerable currency among Presbyterians. Its advocates, however, have never meant by this claim what is asserted for the papal constitution in the bull *Unam Sanctam* (see BONIFACE VIII.) and implied in the anathemas of the Vatican Council. It has not been held at any period that the acceptance of presbyterial rule is a condition of salvation. In the Westminster Assembly there were stanch Presbyterians, and enough of them to constitute a respectable minority, who opposed the theory of the *jus divinum*. In later declarations it has often been affirmed that the presbyterial form of church government is agreeable to and founded on the Word of God. But no violence is done in construing these statements in the sense of this declaration in the Book of Church Order of the Presbyterian Church South (1879): "The scriptural doctrine of presbytery is necessary to the perfection of the order of the visible Church, but is not essential to its existence."

2. Divine Right; Characteristics.

The central feature of Presbyterian church constitution is a series of governing assemblies, constituted on the principle of representation, in which series the decisions of a lower assembly are subject to revision by a higher, up to one vested with supreme jurisdiction though not free in its exercise from certain constitutional restrictions. A second prominent feature is the parity of ministers, or the exclusion of all hierarchical gradations. A third feature is the union of ministers and laymen in the governing assemblies. According to a typical arrangement the governing assemblies are of four kinds, namely, church session, presbytery, synod, and general assembly. The first, which is entrusted with the supervision of the spiritual interests of the local church, is composed of the pastor and the lay

officials called ruling elders. In the mode of instituting these officials, a congregational element comes into play. Both the pastor and the ruling elders, as is also the case with the board of deacons, are elected by the members of the local church. In respect of the pastor elect, however, the approbation of the presbytery must precede his installation, and the like sanction is requisite in connection with the transfer of a minister to a new pastorate. Within the group of churches, between which it serves as the immediate bond of connection, the presbytery fulfils a highly important and responsible function. It has been characterized as being the most important unit in the presbyterian system. Ministers and elders make up the presbytery as they do also the synod and general assembly.

The presbyterian type obtains in the Dutch Reformed and the German Reformed communions (see REFORMED [DUTCH] CHURCH; REFORMED [GERMAN] CHURCH) as well as in the numerous bodies bearing the Presbyterian name. The polity of Lutheran communions in this country is essentially Presbyterian. There is some distinction, however, as respects the legal authority of the highest assembly. While in the Iowa Synod it may approach the Presbyterian standard, it is very much below that standard in the Synodical Conference, and also below it in theory in the General Synod, the General Council, and the United Synod of the South. In the "Meetings" of the Friends—yearly, quarterly, and monthly—the scheme of a hierarchy of assemblies is illustrated. Still the divergence of their polity from the usual Presbyterian type is by no means slight, since they have no general assembly, and all the meetings are democratic in composition.

VII. Congregational Type: While the distinctive features of the Congregational polity were anticipated in some measure by the Anabaptists (q.v.) on the continent, it was in England at the extreme of the Puritan reaction against prelacy that this polity began in the more positive sense its record in modern history. From the days of Robert Browne, Jeremiah Burroughes, John Greenwood, and John Robinson (qq.v.), in the latter part of the sixteenth century, it has had a continuous succession of earnest adherents. The Pilgrims brought it to Plymouth in 1620, and it remained the distinctive form of church order in New England during the entire colonial period. The Baptists in all fields have been almost universally its stanch advocates. It is represented furthermore by the Disciples of Christ, the Christian Connection, the Unitarians, and most branches of the Adventists (qq.v.). The polity of the Universalists lies between the Congregational and the Presbyterian form.

1. Distribution.

The most pronounced feature of Congregationalism is the autonomy of the individual church. The various churches of a communion may have, very appropriately, means of fellowship and interaction, such as councils, associations, or conventions. But none of these are properly accorded any legislative or judicial authority over the local church. They are assemblies for conference, and their action is ever advisory rather than mandatory. Ecclesiastical sovereignty begins and ends with the local church. [Congregationalists hold as a second fundamental of their polity the fellowship of the churches as exercised in the conventions, associations, and councils referred to.] Within the individual congregation, according to the original New-England scheme, the proper officers were the pastor, the teacher, the ruling elders, and the deacons. The second and third, however, were not long retained. At present, within communions of the Congregational order, the regular officers are very commonly enumerated as simply pastors and deacons. The principle of the separation of Church and State was contained in initial Congregationalism as represented by the teaching of Robert Browne (q.v.). Baptists have always been earnest advocates of that principle. The peculiar conditions, however, in New England, where at first the company of citizens and that of church members were substantially identical, led to a somewhat intimate connection between Church and State. While in important respects the churches continued to exercise the functions of self-governing societies, State patronage and control ran through no insignificant range (cf. W Walker, in *American Church History Series*, iii. 249, New York, 1894). The last remnant of this scheme of Congregational "establishments" disappeared in 1833.

2. Essentials; Divine Right; Church and State.

In recent years there has been relaxation in the advocacy of the divine right of Congregational polity. Representative writers of the Congregationalists repudiate the notion that an exclusive right can be asserted for any given form of church constitution, and affirm that their own polity is happily conformed to New-Testament principles. Among Baptists the teaching is not uniform. The question occurs whether communions which adhere to the Congregational polity have been able to maintain the scheme of direct democracy, or autonomous local churches, without substantial modification. One indisputable fact is that within the last century instrumentalities for giving expression to the collective sentiment and enterprise of the whole group of churches of like name have been greatly multiplied. Very frequently the advocates of the Congregational polity declare that the style of collectivism which has thus been evolved works no detriment to the Congregational principle, since the councils or associations which have been instituted are engaged to respect the autonomy of the local church. On the other hand, some admit that the introduction of these bodies and the enlargement in various respects of their functions amount to the intrusion of a Presbyterian element into the actual administration.

VIII. Eclectic Types (Methodist Churches): Among communions which illustrate a union of Presbyterian and Episcopalian elements a prominent place is occupied by the Methodist Episcopal Churches (see METHODISTS). There is also a union of Presbyterian and Episcopalian elements in the church order of the United Brethren in Christ, of the Evangelical Association, and of the Unity of

1. Constituent Elements.

the Brethren (qq.v.). The Congregational element (in certain features of local self-government) discoverable in the churches mentioned is relatively inconspicuous. Recent developments in these communions have been largely in the direction of enlarging the sphere of popular government. By the last part of the nineteenth century all had come to include laymen in the higher governing assemblies. The same kind of development has been illustrated in non-episcopal Methodism, as, for instance, among the English Wesleyans (see METHODISTS, I., 1, §§ 6, 8). In the Methodist Protestant Church lay delegation has been a feature from the start (see METHODISTS, IV., 3).

2. Resultant Forms of Government.

Within the principal Methodist churches the list of assemblies includes quarterly, annual, and general conferences. Between the first and the second the district conference is often interposed. Where existing it assumes various functions which otherwise would fall to the quarterly conferences. The latter are made up of the officials of the individual church—its resident ministers, local preachers, trustees, stewards, class leaders, Sunday-school superintendent, etc. The district conference consists of ministerial and lay delegates. The annual conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church is (1910) a ministerial body; that of the Methodist Episcopal Church South includes, besides the ministers, four laymen from each presiding elder's district. The general conferences of both churches are made up of ministers and laymen in equal numbers. Among the United Brethren in Christ (q.v.) laymen are accorded a place in all the governing assemblies. The general conference is the supreme tribunal in the entire group of communions under consideration. Within certain constitutional limitations it exercises full legislative and judicial authority. A special feature in the constitution of the Methodist Episcopal Church South is the provision that the board of bishops may challenge the constitutionality of a rule or regulation passed by the general conference, and hold it suspended until it has been approved in the use of the regular method for amending a "restrictive rule" (that is, one of the cardinal limitations imposed by the constitution). As a Presbyterian element finds illustration in the governing assemblies of the Methodist economy, so an Episcopalian element is exemplified in its ministerial ranks. In that economy deacon and elder (or presbyter) are related much as they are in the Church of England and in the Protestant Episcopal Church (q.v.). Methodist episcopacy, on the other hand, has a special character as being non-diocesan. It is also free from the aristocratic assumptions often connected with the episcopal form of organization. Methodist bishops are simply the foremost rank of executives in their respective communions. In the Book of Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church a note prefixed to the form of episcopal consecration implies that bishops represent a distinct office rather than a distinct order. It remains true, nevertheless, that in the larger Methodist bodies very weighty official (executive, not legislative) responsibilities are devolved upon the bishops. The legal prerogative is with them to station all the ministers (outside the limited circle of general conference appointees), though the advice of the presiding elders and the preferences of the individual churches are practically of great moment. Methodist communions generally which have an episcopal organization, as also the United Brethren in Christ and the Evangelical Association (qq.v.), make use of a kind of subepiscopate embodied in presiding elders or district superintendents, who are placed over divisions of the territory of the annual conferences. Among the Unity of the Brethren the Presbyterian feature is prominent, the bishops, aside from the function of ordaining, having *ex officio* no administrative significance, and coming in practise to possess such significance only as being customarily elected to the governing boards and conferences.

Connection with the State has been foreign to Methodist history, and the same is true of the doctrine of the divine right of a specific form of ecclesiastical polity. On this theme Methodists stand with Lutherans, and only insist that in its spirit ecclesiastical administration is obligated to be conformable to the demands of the New-Testament conception of Christian citizenship.

IX. Conclusion: In view of the enthronement of an extreme dogma as respects ecclesiastical monarchy in the Roman Catholic Church, and the propagation of a radical type of sacerdotalism through a considerable section of the Church of England, it can not be said that recent movements in the field of church polity have been uniformly in a single direction. There has been an undeniable advance in the line of the most pronounced High-church assumptions. But some rather significant tokens of reaction are already apparent. The universal movement toward constitutional rule in the secular sphere tends to make men restive under the demands of a pretentious sacerdotalism. In the ecclesiastical sphere generally, outside of the specified domains—not to mention the comparatively stationary Orthodox Eastern Church—the development in recent times has been almost uniformly in favor of popular government. Whether it has been in the interest of the specifically democratic form of ecclesiastical polity, with its emphasis on the autonomy of the local church, is a question which is likely to elicit different answers. Probably the balance is not on that side, but rather on the side of some form of representative government, though in constructing this form it may not be out of place to give a larger scope to the proper Congregational element than is done ordinarily in Presbyterian communions or in those which combine Presbyterian with Episcopalian characteristics.

On a couple of points the development has been quite pronounced. The doctrine of divine right, in anything like a stringent form, has been consigned to a diminishing constituency. A close union of Church and State, or one which makes either essentially a dependency of the other, has become through a widening circle a matter of distinct opposition.

HENRY C. SHELDON.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Richard Hooker, *Ecclesiastical Polity*, London, 1594–1662, best ed. by J. Keble, 3d ed., 3 vols.,

1845 (frequently republished); Bingham, *Origines* (these two books are standard and with their constant citation of historical sources may not be overlooked). Consult further the works on church law (*Kirchenrecht*) by P. Hergenröther, Freiburg, 1905; G. Phillips, Regensburg, 1845–89; J. Winkler, Lucerne, 1878; R. Sohm, Leipsic, 1892; J. B. Sägmüller, Freiburg, 1904; and E. Friedberg, 6th ed., ib. 1909 (contains an extensive and classified list of works, pp. 5–12). Also: S. Davidson, *Ecclesiastical Polity of the N. T. Unfolded and its Points of Coincidence or Disagreement with Prevailing Systems Indicated*, London, 1850; F. Wayland, *Notes on the Principles and Practices of Baptist Churches*, New York, 1857; T. Harnack, *Die Kirche, ihr Amt, ihr Regiment*, Nuremberg, 1862; W. Cunningham, *Discussions on Church Principles*, Edinburgh, 1863; O. Mejer, *Die Grundlagen des lutherischen Kirchenregiments*, Rostock, 1864; W. L. Clay, *Essays on Church Polity*, London, 1868; T. Witherow, *The Apostolic Church, which is it? An Inquiry . . whether any existing Form of Church Government is of Divine Right*, new ed., Belfast, 1869; G. A. Jacob, *Ecclesiastical Polity of the N. T.*, London, 1871; W. Pierce, *Ecclesiastical Principles and Polity of the Wesleyan Methodists*, ib. 1873; E. M. Goulburn, *The Holy Catholic Church; its divine Ideal, Ministry, and Institutions*, New York, 1875; C. Hodge, *Discussions in Church Polity*, ib. 1878; E. Hatch, *Organization of the Early Christian Churches*, London, 1881; G. T. Ladd, *The Principles of Church Polity*, New York, 1882; A. A. Pelliccia, *The Polity of the Christian Church of Early, Mediæval, and Modern Times*, London, 1883; E. D. Morris, *Ecclesiology*, ib. 1885; W. D. Killen, *The Framework of the Church; a Treatise on Church Government*, Edinburgh, 1890; D. Palmieri, *Tractatus de Romano pontifice*, Rome, 1891; F. Markower, *Die Verassung der Kirche von England*, Berlin, 1894; W. J. Seabury, *An Introduction to the Study of Ecclesiastical Polity*, New York, 1894; A. Leroy-Beaulieu, *The Empire of the Tsars and Russians*, part 3, ib. 1896; C. Gore, *Essays in Aid of the Reform of the Church*, London, 1898; K. Ricker, *Grundsätze reformierter Kirchenverfassung*, Leipsic, 1899; E. L. Cutts, *A Handy Book of the Church of England*, London, 1900; G. M. Boynton, *The Congregational Way*, New York, 1903; H. Gallwitz, *Die Grundlagen der Kirche*, Eisenach, 1904; J. J. Tigert, *A Constitutional Hist. of American Episcopal Methodism*, Nashville, 1904; E. C. Dargan, *Ecclesiology*, Louisville, 1905; H. H. Henson, *Moral Discipline in the Christian Church*, London, 1905; A. Fortescue, *The Orthodox Eastern Church*, ib. 1907; W. F. Adeney, *The Greek and Eastern Churches*, pp. 132–146, 325–354, 404–433, New York, 1908; H. C. Sheldon, *Sacerdotalism in the 19th Century*, ib. 1909. For the details of polity the reader is referred to the Books of Discipline and Church Order issued by the various ecclesiastical bodies, and to the literature under the articles to which reference is made in the text, especially the bibliographies attached to the various denominational articles.

POLLOCK, BERTRAM: Church of England bishop; b. at Wimbledon (7 m. s. of St. Paul's, London) Dec. 6, 1863. He received his education at Trinity College, Cambridge (B.A., 1885; M.A., 1889; B.D., 1902; D.D., 1903); was made deacon in 1890 and priest in 1891; was assistant master at Marlborough College, 1886–93; master of Wellington College, 1893–1910; and became bishop of Norwich in 1910. He served also as select preacher at Cambridge in 1895, and at Oxford in 1907–08; examining chaplain to the bishop of Litchfield, 1900–10; and chaplain in ordinary to the king, 1904–10.

POLLOK, ALLAN: Presbyterian; b. at Buckhaven (15½ m. s.w. of St. Andrews), Fifeshire, Scotland, Oct. 19, 1829. He was educated at the University of Glasgow (M.A., 1852), was sent by the Colonial Committee of the Church of Scotland to Nova Scotia, where he was minister of St. Andrew's, New Glasgow (1852–75), professor of church history and practical theology in the Presbyterian College, Halifax (1875–1904), acting also as principal (1886–1904). He still lectures occasionally in the college, and in theology is a "moderate Calvinist, holding the doctrines of the Westminster Confession in all essentials." He has written *Lectures on the Book of Common Order* (New York, 1897), and *Studies in Practical Theology* (Edinburgh, 1907).

POLLOK, ROBERT: Scotch poet; b. at North Moorhouse, Eaglesham Parish (8 m. s. of Glasgow), Renfrewshire, Oct. 19, 1798; d. at Shirley Common, near Southampton, Sept. 18, 1827 He graduated at Glasgow University (M.A., 1822); and studied theology at Union Secession Hall and Glasgow University (1822–27). He is famous for *The Course of Time*, a religious poem, projected on a stupendous scale, in ten books, on the destiny of man (London, 1827; seventy-eighth thousand, 1868; many editions in the United States). He was the author, also, of *Helen of the Glen* (Glasgow, 1830), *The Persecuted Family* (3d ed., Edinburgh, 1829), and *Ralph Gemmell* (1829); the three republished separately and together under the title, *Tales of the Covenanters* (Edinburgh, 1833; later ed., 1895).

Bibliography: D. Pollok, *The Life of Robert Pollok, . . with Selections from his Correspondence*, Edinburgh, 1843; a *Memoir* prefixed to later issues of *The Course of Time;* and *DNB*, xlvi. 69–70.

POLYCARP: Bishop of Smyrna and martyr; b. in the second half of the first century; d. at Smyrna Feb. 23, 155. He is first mentioned in the letters of Ignatius to the Ephesians (xxi. 1; Eng. transl., *ANF*, i. 58) and to the Magnesians (xv.; Eng. transl., *ANF*, i. 65) and to Polycarp. The Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians, however, is a letter written to accompany the transmission of the letters of Ignatius and was requested by the Philippians (xiii.; Eng. transl., *ANF*, i. 36). Those who dispute the letters of Ignatius as genuine would have to reject this also as an interpolation; yet it should not be overlooked that Irenæus had this letter in mind as a witness of Polycarp's faith and his preaching of the truth (*Hær.*, iii. 3–4, Eng. transl., *ANF*, i. 416). The charge that it was falsified together with the letters of Ignatius is excluded by the peculiar character of the epistle and the charge of interpolation is contradicted by the use of I Clement, equally distributed throughout all the parts. The desire of Ignatius expressed in "To the Smyrneans," xi. (Eng transl., *ANF*, i. 91) and "To Polycarp," viii. (Eng. transl., *ANF*, i. 100) throws light on the letter or letters of the Philippians to be transmitted to the Syrians mentioned in xiii. of Polycarp's letter. This letter of Polycarp was therefore written at the time of the martyrdom of Ignatius in the reign of Trajan (98–117). It is preserved in Greek only together with the Epistle of Barnabas as far as ix. 2; the remainder, in an inaccurate Latin translation (ix. and xiii. also in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, III., xxxvi. 13–15; Eng. transl., *NPNF*, 2 ser., i. 168–169). The points of recognition of the letter through Irenæus are substantiated by the contents: Christ, who has suffered for us and as the risen one is exalted, will also raise us if we do the will of God. Its admonitions deal plainly with the Christian walk in life, in reli-

ance upon the New-Testament Scriptures, especially I Peter. The apostasy of a presbyter Valens is deplored (xi.). He writes of the Smyrnean congregation, whose representative he and the presbyters in whose name he writes are, that (in contrast with the Philippians) in the time of Paul they knew not yet God (xi.; Eng. transl., *ANF*, i. 35). This does not show that he and the presbyters lived at that time, but that the Philippians turned to him, and Ignatius considers his intercourse with him as worthy of mention and writes to him personally, inasmuch as Polycarp must have been by 110–115 a widely known personage.

This is corroborated by the letter which the Smyrnean congregation directed to the congregation at Philomelium and all the congregations of the Catholic Church concerning the martyrdom of Polycarp, less than a year later (xviii. 2; Eng. transl., *ANF*, i. 43), which points not only to the esteem in which he was held in his own congregation but to his fame also outside of the Church (xvi., xii.; Eng. transl., i. 43; cf. Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, Eng. transl., *NPNF*, 2 ser., i. 188–193). The accounts of his martyrdom have received confirmation from inscriptions discovered since 1880 (cf. J. B. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, i. 613 sqq.) which also prove the reliability of the additional chapter xxi. not known to Eusebius; for they prove Philip the asiarch (xii.) and high-priest of Tralles (xxi.) to have been asiarch in 149–153, and high-priest and agonothete at Tralles since 137 for life. From this additional chapter, the Acts of Pionius, and the ancient martyrology it is seen that Polycarp was martyred Feb. 23, on a greater Jewish Sabbath (viii. 1, xxi.; perhaps feast of Purim; cf. Lightfoot, ut sup. 692 sqq.) during the proconsulship of Statius Quadratus, fixed by Waddington, using the representations of the rhetorician Aristides, at 154–156, during which the 23d of February occurred as a Sabbath only in 155. W Schmid attempts to show that the Quadratus of Aristides, evidently Avillius Urinatius Quadratus the *consul suffectus* of 156, was proconsul in 165–166 under Marcus Aurelius, in accordance with the chronicle of Eusebius delivered by Jerome, Feb. 23, 166, being also on a Sabbath. In all probability, however, the Statius Quadratus of the time of Polycarp's martyrdom is identical with the consul of that name in 142, who, in the course of advancement, must have been the proconsul in 155. The Asiarch Philip also would have been too aged to be high-priest and asiarch in the time of Marcus Aurelius. At the time of his martyrdom Polycarp had been a Christian for eighty-six years (ix.; Eng. transl., ut sup., i. 41). Irenæus relates how and when he became a Christian and in his letter to Florinus (Eusebius, V., xx.; Eng. transl., i. 238–239) stated that he saw and heard him personally in lower Asia; in particular he heard the account of Polycarp's intercourse with John and with others who had seen the Lord. Irenæus also testifies (*Hær.*, iii. 3–4; Eng. transl., *ANF*, i. 415–417) that Polycarp was converted to Christianity by apostles, made a bishop, and had intercourse with many who had seen the Lord. He repeatedly emphasizes the very old age of Polycarp (ut sup.). If the supreme recognition of Polycarp was due to his old age and former intercourse with the apostles, so were likewise his presence in Rome under Anicetus and his success in the conversion of heretics (154). In the disagreement with Anicetus, Polycarp appealed for authority to his intercourse with John and other disciples (Eusebius, V., xxiv. 16, Eng. transl., i. 415–416). Irenæus makes mention of several epistles to neighboring churches and individual Christians which are not extant (Eusebius, V., xx. 8, Eng. transl., i. 239). The *Vita Polycarpi auctore Pionio*, knowing chapter xii. and many letters and homilies of Polycarp, is corrupted with so many fables that to extract the historical is impossible. Feuardentius, in his notes to Irenæus, *Hær*, iii. 3 (Cologne, 1596), gives several fragments ascribed to Polycarp which were preserved in a catena of Victor of Capua in his *Liber responsorum*, to which T. Zahn (*Forschungen*, vi. 103, Leipsic, 1900) admits the possibility of a partial genuineness. The statements of the learned Armenian Ananias of Shirak (600–650) in his "Epiphany of our Lord" also must speak for themselves. See Papias. (N. Bonwetsch.)

Bibliography: The editions of Polycarp best worth noting are those of T. Zahn in Gebhardt, Harnack, and Zahn's *Patrum apostolicorum opera*, ii. 109–133, Leipsic, 1876; F. X. Funk, *Opera patrum apostolicorum*, 2d ed., Tübingen, 1901; J. B. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers*, 1885, 2d ed., 1889, with Eng. transl.; and A. Hilgenfeld, Berlin, 1902. The Eng. transl. most available after that of Lightfoot, is in *ANF*, i. 33–36. For eds. of the *Martyrium* consult *ASB*, Jan., ii. 705 sqq.; E. Amélineau in *PSBA*, x (1888), 391–417; the eds. of Zahn, Funk, and Lightfoot, ut sup.; R. Knopf, *Augsewählten Martyracten*, Tübingen, 1901; and O. von Gebhardt, *Acta martyrum selecta*, Berlin, 1902. Eng. transls. are by Lightfoot, ii. 1057–67, ed. of 1885; and in *ANF*, i. 39–44. The *Vita Polycarpi* of the 4th or 5th century by Pionius (said by Funk to be "worthless") has been edited by L. Duchesne, Paris, 1881; J. B. Lightfoot, ut sup., ii. 1005 sqq., 1068 sqq.; and F. X. Funk, ut sup., ii. 291 sqq.; and is in *ASB*, Jan., ii. 695 sqq. A detailed list of literature is in *ANF*, Bibliography, pp. 7–10. Discussions of the first importance are in the editions and translations noted above, either as preface, prolegomena, or notes. Consult further: Irenæus, *Hær*, III., iii., Eng. transl. *ANF*, i. 416; Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, IV., xv., Eng. transl., *NPNF*, 2 ser., i. 188–193; Jerome, *De vir. ill.*, xvii., Eng. transl., *NPNF*, 2 ser., iii. 367; A. Ritschl, *Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche*, pp. 284 sqq., 584 sqq., Bonn, 1857; J. Donaldson, *Hist. of Christian Literature*, i. 154–200, iii. 306–310, Oxford, 1864–66; idem, *Apostolical Fathers*, pp. 191–247, ib. 1874; T. Zahn, *Ignatius von Antiochen*, pp. 494 sqq., Gotha, 1873; idem, *Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, iv. 249 sqq., vi. 72 sqq., 94 sqq., Leipsic, 1891–1900; [Cassels], *Supernatural Religion*, i. 274–282, ii. 267–271, iii. 13–15, London, 1875; B. F. Westcott, *General Survey of the Hist. of the Canon of the N. T.*, pp. 36–40, ib. 1875; T. Keim, *Aus dem Urchristenthum*, pp. 90–133, Zurich, 1878; G. A. Jackson, *Apostolic Fathers*, pp. 77–87, New York, 1879; F. Piper, *Lives of the Leaders of Our Church Universal*, ed. H. M. MacCracken, pp. 14–22, Philadelphia, 1879; A. H. Charteris, *Canonicity*, passim, London, 1880 (references are very numerous); J. Nirschl, *Lehrbuch der Patrologie und Patristik*, i. 121–131, Mainz, 1881; W. F. Adeney, in *British Quarterly*, lxxxii (1886), 31–67; O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, i. 146 sqq., ii. 615–616, Freiburg, 1902–1903; E. Schwartz, *De Pionio et Polycarpo*, Göttingen, 1905; O. Pfleiderer, *Das Urchristentum*, ii. 256 sqq., Berlin, 1902, Eng. transl., *Christian Origins*, London, 1906; H. Müller, *Aus der Ueberlieferungsgeschichte des Polykarp-Martyrium*, Paderborn, 1908; Harnack, *Geschichte*, i. 69–74, 817, ii. 1, pp. 325 sqq., 334–356, 381–406, ii. 2, pp. 303, 466–467; Krüger, *History*, pp. 25 sqq., 380; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, i. 392–398, 406 sqq., *DNB*, iv. 423–431; the literature under Ignatius of Antioch, and the church historians on the post-apostolic period, e.g.,

Schaff, *Christian Church*, i. 109–111, 299, 335, 465, 661, 677, 680. On the date of the martyrdom consult: R. A. Lipsius, in *JPT*, 1878, pp. 751–768; K. Wieseler, *Christenverfolgungen*, pp. 34–87, Gütersloh, 1878; idem, in *TSK*, liii (1880), 141–165; T. Randell, in *Studia Biblica*, pp. 175–207, Oxford, 1885; W. M. Ramsay in *Expository Times*, Jan., 1907, pp. 188–189.

POLYCHROME BIBLE. See BIBLE TEXT, I., 3, § 4.

POLYCHRONIUS: Bishop of Apamea; flourished in the first half of the fifth century. Of his life nothing is known except that he was the brother of Theodore of Mopsuestia (q.v.), that he was bishop after 428, and that he was one of the most distinguished exegetes of the Antiochian school. Though never expressly anathematized, Polychronius was regarded as a heretic in later times, so of his exegetical works only fragments have been preserved in various catenas. It may be regarded as certain that Polychronius wrote exhaustive commentaries on Job, Daniel, and Ezekiel. The greater part of the fragments preserved are from Daniel, which he interpreted as referring to Antiochus Epiphanes instead of Antichrist, and saw in the fourth monarchy of the world the Macedonian empire, and in the ten heads the Diadochi. He sought always to establish the historical meaning and polemized against allegorical exegesis, as well as against the theory of a twofold sense. As a critic, however, he seems to have been more conservative than his brother. His knowledge of philology, antiquities, and history was considerable, but he shows a comparatively slight acquaintance with the Semitic languages. His Christology was apparently that of his brother, though probably less pronounced.

(A. HARNACK.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Theodoret, *Hist. eccl.*, v. 39, Eng. transl., *NPNF*, 2 ser., iii. 159; O. Bardenhewer, *Polychronius Bruder Theodors*, Freiburg, 1879; Fabricius-Harles, *Bibliotheca Græca*, viii. 638–669, x. 362–363, Hamburg, 1802–1807; *DNB*, iv. 434–436; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, x. 60.

POLYCRATES, pō-lic'ra-tîz: Bishop of Ephesus; flourished in the second century. He is known only bration of Easter (about 190) [to whom he wrote a letter, given in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, V., xxiv., Eng. transl. in *NPNF*, 2 ser., i. 242–244]. The controversy, according to Eusebius, took place under Commodus (d. Dec. 31, 192), and to Maximin of Antioch (whom Serapion succeeded in 190–191) letters are said to have been directed. At this time he had been a Christian sixty-five years, coming of a Christian family which had already furnished seven bishops. Victor had requested him to call a synod to decide the Easter problem (see EASTER); but this synod, led by Polycrates appealing to the usage of Asia Minor, decided in favor of Nisan 14th, whereupon the pope made an unsuccessful attempt to excommunicate the church of Asia Minor.

(N. BONWETSCH.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, V., xxii., xxiv., Eng. transl., *NPNF*, 2 ser., i. 240–244 (cf. note 9 on V. xxii.); Harnack, *Litteratur*, i. 260, ii. 1, p. 323; T. Zahn, *Forschungen zur Geschichte der neutestamentlichen Kanons*, iii. 187, vi. 162–163, 169 sqq., 208 sqq., Leipsic, 1890–1900, O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Litteratur*, i. 580, Freiburg, 1902; *DNB*, iv. 436–437; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, i. 535, ii. 542–543.

POLYGLOT BIBLES. See BIBLES, POLYGLOT.

POLYTHEISM.

I. Scope and Definition.
Meaning in Scripture (§ 1).
Lapse from Monotheism (§ 2).
II. Classification.
Fetishism (§ 1).
Animism (§ 2).
Sabaism (§ 3).
III. Development.
A Corruption of Monotheism (§ 1).
IV. Ethical Estimation.

I. Scope and Definition: Polytheism or the doctrine and belief that there are more gods than one is the more scientific term for what is otherwise known as idolatry and heathenism, and refers to those religions which are in contradistinction to the monotheism of Judaism, Christianity, and Mohammedanism. It is based on the natural tendency of man to seek religious relations with deity in the light of the revelation of natural religion alone. In the evolutionary process nature proceeds from plurality to unity, and even pantheism appears as a philosophical elaboration and inspiration of primitive polytheism. The verdict of both the Old and the New Testament on the nature and value of polytheism is essentially the same. Polytheism is the lapse from the living God to the worship of vain idols and the perversion of divinely revealed truth in order to smuggle in falsehood, darkness of spirit, and association with demons. The gods of the heathen are powerless (Jer. ii. 28; Isa. xli. 29, xlii. 17, xlvi. 1 sqq.), and made by man from perishable material (especially Isa. xli., xliv.; Ps. cxv. 4 sqq., cxxxv. 15–18). So far as they really exist, they are demons (Deut. xxxii. 17; cf. Deut. x. 17, xxxii. 17; Ps. xcvi. 15, cvi. 27). In the New Testament idols are vain, and are not really gods (Acts xiv. 15, xix. 26; I Cor. viii. 5; Gal. iv. 8), and he who eats of their offerings eats the meat of demons (I Cor. x. 19–21; Rev. ix. 20).

1. Meaning in Scripture.

In considering the origin of polytheism, the usual development of pantheism from an earlier polytheism, illustrated in India by Brahmanism and in Greece by the Eleatic and Stoic systems, would naturally lead one to consider the primitive form of all religion to consist in the worship of a plurality of gods from which even Biblical monotheism was developed. Nevertheless, neither the Pentateuch nor the prophetic writings contain any traces whatsoever of an earlier polytheism, and the Old Testament very definitely regards the polytheism of the heathen as caused by a fall from primitive monotheism in the account of the tower of Babel (Gen. xi. 1 sqq.). The gradual development of polytheism from an original monotheism is supported by the history of Abraham (Gen. xiv. 18–20; Josh. xxiv. 2 sqq.); of Jacob, who saw the introduction of Teraphim (q.v.) into his household (Gen. xxxi. 19–20, xxxv. 2–3); of Joseph, who married the daughter of an Egyptian priest of the sun (Gen. xli. 50), and of Moses who was able to keep his people true to the God of the covenant only by bitter struggle against the paganism of Egypt and Midian (cf. Num. xii. 1 sqq.; Deut. xxxii. 15 sqq.; Amos v. 25–26). Similar views are presented in the New Testament, as in Rom. i. 21 sqq.; Acts xiv. 16, xvii. 29.

2. Lapse from Monotheism.

II. Classification: Granted that the theory of evolution is legitimate in the domain of natural science, the question arises whether it applies as well to this sphere in view of the facts of religious history. From the time of David Hume (q.v.) and the English deists and of the German G. L. Bauer, the theory of the origin of monotheism from polytheism has passed through three definite stages: gods were derived either from fetishes, dead ancestors or other spirits, or from the heavenly bodies. These three theories may conveniently be termed fetishism, animism (with its varieties of spiritism, Shamanism, q.v., ancestor worship, hero cult), and Sabaism.

1. Fetishism.

The theory of Fetishism (q.v.), dating from the period of Voltaire and Hume, was essentially established by Charles De Brosses in his *Du culte des dieux fétiches* (Paris, 1760), and was further developed by Auguste Comte (especially in the fifth volume of his *Cours de philosophie positive* (Paris, 1830–42), who assumed that from the worship of rude objects of a childlike superstition in magic, or fetishes, was developed first the polytheism of more civilized pagan nations, while from the latter was evolved monotheism as the highest ethical form of religion. This has become a favorite dogma of positivists in France, England, and North America as well as Germany, as illustrated by Lord Avebury's *Origin of Civilization* (London, 1870); S. Baring Gould's *Origin and Development of Religious Belief* (1869); C. Meiners, who held, in his *Allgemeine kritische Geschichte der Religionen* (Hanover, 1806), that fetishism was not only the oldest but also the most general form of worship; G. P. C. Kaiser in his *Biblische Theologie* (Erlangen, 1813–21); Hegel in his *Vorlesungen über Philosophie der Religion* (Berlin, 1832) maintaining that magic, constantly changing its objects of worship in the form of fetishism, creates the first and lowest type of religion; and T. Waitz, in his *Anthropologie der Naturvölker* (Leipsic, 1859–65). The fetishistic theory was developed into a formal system by F. Schultze in *Der Fetischismus, ein Beitrag zur Anthropologie und Religionsgeschichte* (Leipsic, 1871), in which an interpretation of the individual tendencies of fetishism is attempted, on the assumption that the rudest fetishism of modern aborigines is necessarily the closest in approximation to the primitive type of all religions. This theory of fetishism has exercised more or less influence on historians of civilization like K. Twesten and F. von Hellwald, natural philosophers like C. Sterne, E. Haeckel, and investigators of religions like A. Wuttke, whose *Geschichte des Heidentums* (Breslau, 1852–53), while proceeding from a rigidly monotheistic basis, regards fetishism as the oldest and most primitive type of religion known to history; and G. Roskoff in *Geschichte des Teufels* (Leipsic, 1869) and *Religionswesen der rohesten Naturvölker* (1880). In opposition to the frequent assumption after Darwin that there are numerous primitive peoples without any trace of religion, so that absolute atheism is alleged to be the real basis and starting period of the entire religious and ethical development of mankind, Roskoff, in the latter work, marshaled an array of facts confirmed by a company of scholars; but he falls in also with the naturalistic view, regarding magic as the prototype of all religious activity. The theory of fetishism is scientifically false. The fetish is not, according to De Brosses and the other naturalists, an enchanted and therefore prophetic object (as if from *fari, fanum,* or *fatum*), but is something artificially made (Portuguese, *feitiço*—Latin *facere*) especially for religious purposes, such as an amulet, cross, or idol. Properly speaking, fetishes are devotional or cultic objects which imply a relatively developed stage of religion, and are even typical of an incipient decay of religious life. They are invariably relics of an older and more perfect concept of the deity; for some sort of an idea of a higher being to be invoked must have been present before steps could be taken to make a fetish. The stone, block, bone, or rag, which forms such a magic idol for the African, was never anything but an idol capriciously adapted to a long developed, even though rough and vague, concept of God. The worship of fetishes forms a rude parallel to the veneration of relics and objects of superstition like the tooth of Buddha in Ceylon, Mohammedan talismans, Greco-Roman amulets, or the teraphim or earthern serpents of the peoples with whom the Israelities came in contact. Far from belonging to the childhood of religion, as Meiners, Hegel, Lord Avesbury, and others have held, on the ground of the puppet shape of the fetishes and the childish homage of dances and drummings in their honor, fetishism is decadent, even as senility frequently assumes an appearance of childishness. Neither fetishism nor the primitive atheism assumed by Avesbury can rationally be made the foundation of religious development either of mankind as a whole or of individual stocks or peoples (cf. J. Happel, *Die Anlage des Menschen zur Religion,* pp. 112, 134 sqq., Leyden, 1877; O. Pfleiderer, *Religionsphilosophie,* pp. 318–319, 742–743, Berlin, 1878; F. M. Müller, *Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion,* especially vol. ii., London, 1878; P. Schanz, *Apologie des Christentums,* 2d ed., ii. 37, 297, and passim, Freiburg, 1887–88; and C. von Orelli, *Allgemeine Religionsgeschichte,* pp. 15, 265–266, 841–842, Bonn, 1899). [For another view of the subject, see FETISHISM.]

2. Animism.

The animistic hypothesis, or soul-cult, as the source of all religious development is considerably later than that of fetishism. As introduced into comparative religion by E. B. Tylor in his *Primitive Culture* (London, 1871; new ed., 1903) and *Anthropology* (1881) animism denotes a belief, wide-spread among the primitive peoples throughout the world, in more or less powerful souls or spirits dwelling in material objects, in a word, "spirit worship" (cf. J. Lippert, *Der Seelenkult nach seinen Beziehungen zur hebräischen Religion,* Berlin, 1881; O. Seeck, *Geschichte des Untergangs der antiken Welt,* pp. 339–377, Berlin, 1901). Logically, this form of religion is a grade higher than fetishism, regarding its cultic objects as filled with, or possessed of, certain spiritual beings, which human magic can cause to appear and become operative. At the same time, cruder fetishistic views and usages are found in animism, especially in the magic character of the

priests of both types. Three forms of animism may be distinguished: physiolatric, anthropolatric, and patriarcholatric. Physiolatric animism is the worship of certain nature spirits residing in wells or rivers (nymphs, nixies), in hills or rocks (cobalds), in trees (hamadryads), or in animals, and the like, the two chief subdivisions being the two last, phytolatry and zoolatry, the latter comprising ophiolatry. Anthropolatric animism is the worship of the dead, whether regarded as being in some inanimate medium or in some living animal from simple inhabitation to metempsychosis; this type is the darkest of spiritism issuing in necromancy and fanatical Shamanism. Patriarcholatry, or ancestor worship, is the worship of the ancestors of special families or entire stocks, this frequently passing over among wild tribes into totemism, in which the ancestors are held to have been certain beasts or birds, which thus become fixed emblems of the families or stocks in question. All attempts to make any or all of these types of animism the source of the development of religion have failed. Ancestor worship in particular, defended by H. Spencer in his *Principles of Sociology* (London, 1876–82), J. Lippert (ut sup.), and others, is rendered nugatory because the pious regard of ancestors presupposes too long a development and too ripe a civilization to be regarded as the primitive source of religion; as, for instance, the Chinese cult and the Pitris and Rishis of India and the Greeks. See Comparative Religion, VI., 1, a, §§ 1–6; Heathenism, §§ 2–4, 6.

The Sabaistic theory, or the assumption that the cult of the heavenly bodies is the source of religion, seems to go back, strictly speaking, to such Church Fathers as Clement of Alexandria, and Firmicius Maternus, who held that, while monotheism was the original religion, the stages of de-

3. Sabaism. cline had begun with the worship of the heavenly bodies. They were closely followed by Moses Maimonides (q.v.), and, among more recent students, by those who investigate mainly religions possessing an astronomical basis, as the Egyptian, Babylonian, and Phenician. A chief exponent of this theory was the French astronomer C. F. Dupuis, who, in his *Origine de tous les cultes ou religion* (12 vols., Paris, 1795), sought to prove that worship first of the sun and then of the other heavenly bodies was the point of departure for all religious evolution. Similar attempts were made by J. A. Kanne in *Neue Darstellung der Mythologie der Griechen* (Leipsic, 1805), J. G. Rohde in *Versuch über das Alter des Tierkreises und den Alter der Sternbilder* (Breslau, 1809), E. von Bunsen in his *Einheit der Religion* (Berlin, 1870) and *Die Plejaden und der Tierkreis* (1879), and C. Ploix in *La Nature des dieux* (Paris, 1888), in which he blended Sabaism and fetishism. If, however, a stellar cult developed into adoration of the zodiac, the planets, and other celestial objects, it presupposes a degree of culture which is incompatible with the primitive period of mankind. The truly primitive forms of worship of the heavenly bodies seem rather to be monotheistic, the divine element being regarded not so much as the sun, moon, or "host of heaven," as the heaven itself as the symbol or manifestation of the highest beneficent power, in comparison with which the individual stars constituted mere subdeities. A number of adherents of primitive monotheism have accordingly regarded Sabaism as the mediate stage through which man passed in his decline from monotheism to the baser forms of polytheism. Criticism of Sabaism leads necessarily to the positing of a primitive monotheism though not in its absolute form.

III. Development: A relative monotheism, consisting of a theistic basis with pantheistic elements, was assumed as the basis of all religious development by Schelling in *Philosophie der Metologie und Offenbarung* (Stuttgart, 1856–59), and he was followed by many others. This relative monotheism of the earliest historic period was termed kathenotheism or henotheism by Max Müller; and though restricted by him only to certain characteristics of the Vedic religion, yet it may well be applied, *mutatis mutandis*, to the earliest periods of the religion of various other peoples of similar antiquity. This henotheism is defined by Müller as a naive faith in individual powers of nature which alternately appear as supreme. The religion of the Chinese seems to be an unfolding of the cult of heaven, and early Iranian religious records show similar traces of a relatively pure primitive monotheism, since between the supreme creator of the universe, Ormazd, and his subordinate deities, the six Amshaspands, a considerable interval is held to exist. The oldest religious concepts of the other Indo-Germanic peoples were richer in polytheistic elements, though even in them the sky-god was dominant. Among the religions of southwestern Asia, the ancient Arabs and the Phenicians had a basis of primitive monotheism, consisting in the worship of a supreme god of the light or of the sun (Ilâh or Shamsh in North Arabia, Bel among the Sabeans of South Arabia, and Baal Hamman among the Phenicians), though even in the earliest records this basis had received many accretions of stellar polytheism. The same statements hold good of the religion of ancient Babylonia. The most ancient supreme sky-god Anu must early have received by his side a Bel and an Ea, their number later being increased by various younger nature deities, such as the moon-god Sin and the sun-god Shamash, as well as the five planetary deities Marduk, Ishtar, Adar, Nergal, and Nebo. Many of the most competent Egyptologists agree in placing at the head of the development of the Nilotic religion a creative celestial "king" or "father" of the gods, who was called Amon-Ra by the Thebans and Ptah at Memphis; and Le Page Renouf, in his *Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion*, p. 119 (London, 1880), declares: "The sublimer portions [of the Egyptian religion] are not the comparatively late results of a process of development or elimination from the grosser. The sublimer portions are demonstrably ancient; and the last stage of the Egyptian religion, that known to the Greek and Latin writers, was by far the grossest and most corrupt."

1. A Corruption of Monotheism.

It must not be supposed, however, that this process of degeneration from monotheism everywhere

took the same course or passed through the same phases. In like manner, various motives entered into the creation of early myths; and neither the one-sided interpretation of myths as personifications of meteorological phenomena nor the one-sided anthropology of the euhemerists nor the operation of diabolical forces as held by early orthodoxy is in accord with the actual state of affairs.

IV. Ethical Estimation: Regarding the relation of polytheism to morality, the stern judgment must hold which the Old and the New Testament alike pronounce upon idolatry without distinction of its various forms or grades. Idolaters are evildoers punished by the law with the severest penalties, and upbraided by the prophets for their enormities. In the New Testament sinners and heathen are parallel (Matt. xviii. 17; Gal. ii. 15; I Cor. v. 1), while idolatry is classed among the "works of the flesh," being placed between lasciviousness and sorcery (Gal. v. 20), and repeatedly designated as belonging to the worst abominations (Romans ii. 22; Rev. ii. 15, 20, ix. 21, xvii. 4–5, xviii. 22) and as leading to the gravest sensuality (Rom. i. 24–28). And this judgment not only holds true of classical antiquity, but of modern primitive peoples as well.

(O. Zöcklerâ€ .)

The conclusions reached by the author of the preceding article are not those of the modern school of comparative religionists. Every line of evidence exhaustively examined by these students leads to results that are in complete accord with the science of anthropology, which regards man himself as a development. Religion appears distinctly and unmistakably as a growth, in which monotheism is the choicest fruit, not the root. Wherever the history of religion can be traced for long periods, as in Babylonia and China, and now in Greece, the farther back one searches the more diffused is the worship, until the gods are lost in spirits or demons. This is confirmed by the study of primitive religion, where the objects of worship are spirits, not gods, with rare exceptions, and these exceptions afford no support to the theory of monotheism as original. Similarly in the organized religions, the irrational and animistic elements, for instance of ritual (in which are always preserved longest the traces of origin), are clearly derivable from the earlier stages and point to polytheism or animism, never to monotheism. While there may be reversion of a people from monotheism to polytheism (as in the decadent period of Jewish history), the case can always be shown to be reversion and not degeneration. The background of Hebrew religion is now recognized by the entire critical school as not only polytheistic but animistic. A case of this is the action of Jacob in anointing the stone (an act of worship) on which he slept while he saw his vision (Gen. xxviii. 18), which action was precisely that which Arab tribes directed to the stone deities which they worshiped (Smith, *Rel. of Sem.*, passim). The first commandment is an explicit recognition of the existence of other deities.

The conclusions of comparative religionists as to the order of development in religion are briefly indicated in Comparative Religion (q.v., especially VI., 2, d).

Geo. W. Gilmore.

Bibliography: Much of the best literature is named in the text, and many of the works given under Comparative Religion and Fetishism are of first importance; use also the literature under separate lands, as Africa, China, Japan, etc. Consult further: A. Wuttke, *Geschichte des Heidentums*, 2 vols., Breslau, 1852–53; K. Werner, *Die Religionen und Kultur des vorchristlichen Heidentums*, Schaffhausen, 1871; E. L. Fischer, *Heidentum und Offenbarung*, Mainz, 1878; J. Legge, *Religions of China*, London, 1881; E. G. Steude, *Ein Problem der allgemeinen Religionswissenschaft*, Leipsic, 1881; G. Rawlinson, *The Religions of the Ancient World*, London, 1882; C. F. Heman, *Der Ursprung der Religion*, Basel, 1886; W. Schneider, *Die Naturvölker*, 3 vols., Münster, 1885–91; idem, *Geschichte der Religion im Altertum*, 2 parts, Gotha, 1895–98; K. von Orelli, *Allgemeine Religionsgeschichte*, Bonn, 1899; G. Stosch, *Das Heidentum als religiöses Problem*, Gütersloh, 1903; W. Mundt, *Völkerpsychologie*, Leipsic, 1904 sqq.; W. Bousset, *What is Religion?* New York, 1907; A. Bros, *La Religion des peuples non civilisés*, Paris, 1907; F. X. Kortleitner, *De polytheismo universo et quibusdam eius formis apud Hebræos finitimasque gentes usitatis*, Innsbruck, 1908; G. Foucart, *La Méthode comparative dans l'histoire des religions*, Paris, 1909; L. Frobenius, *The Childhood of Man*, London, 1909; A. Le Roy, *La Religion des primitifs*, Paris, 1909; J. H. Leuba, *Psychological Origin and Nature of Religion*, London, 1909; S. Reinach, *Orpheus. Hist. générale des religions*, Paris, 1909, Eng. transl., *Orpheus*, London, 1909; W. St. C. Tisdall, *Mythic Christs and the True: a Criticism of some modern Theories*, London, 1909; H. G. Underwood, *Religions of Eastern Asia*, New York, 1910.

POMERIUS, JULIANUS: Gallican presbyter of Moorish descent; d. about 490. He is said by Cyprian to have been the teacher of famous Cæsarius of Arles (q.v.), and according to the spurious addition to Gennadius' *De vir. ill.* (xcviii.) and Isidore's *De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis* (xv.), he wrote a dialogue *De animæ natura* (or *De natura animæ et qualitate ejus*) in eight books and a treatise *De vita contemplativa* (or *De contemptu mundi*) in three books. The first book of the latter work (*MPL*, lix. 415–520) treats of the value of the contemplative life, the second of the active life of the Christian, and the third of vices and virtues. The entire works are full of the spirit of Augustine. The similarity of the latter treatise to the eschatological meditations of St. Julian, bishop of Toledo, early led to Julian's identification with Pomerius, who flourished fully two centuries before him. Julian, a convert from Judaism, was archbishop from Jan. 29, 680, to Mar. 8, 690, and was zealous in defending and extending the faith and reformation of the clergy, at the same time maintaining a firm attitude toward Benedict II. when the pope criticized his creed. His apology addressed to Benedict, together with some of his other works, has been lost; but his *Prognosticorum futuri seculi libri tres* (Leipsic, 1535); *De demonstratione sextæ ætatis* (Heidelberg, 1532); and *Historia Wambæ regis Toletani* (*MPL*, xcvi.) are extant. He probably took part in the final redaction of the old Spanish liturgy and of the Visigothic canon law.

(O. Zöcklerâ€ .)

Bibliography: *Histoire littéraire de la France*, ii. 665–675; J. Nirschl, *Lehrbuch der Patrologie und Patristik*, iii. 285 sqq., Mainz, 1881; F. Arnold, *Cäsarius von Arelate*, pp. 80–84, 124–129, Leipsic, 1894; O. Bardenhewer, *Patrologie*, p. 540, Freiburg, 1901, Eng. transl., St. Louis, 1908; O. Zöckler, *Die Tugendlehre des Christentums*, pp. 93–95, Gütersloh, 1904.

On Julian of Toledo consult: *Patrum Toletanorum . Opera*, ed. F. Lorenzano, pp. 3–385, Madrid, 1785; J. de Mariana, *Historiæ de rebus Hispaniæ*, vi. 248–249, Mainz, 1605, Eng. transl., *The General Hist. of Spain*, 2 parts, London, 1699; P. B. Gams, *Kirchengeschichte von Spanien*,

ii. 2, pp. 176–238, 3 vols., Regensburg, 1862–79; F. Dahn, *Verfassung der Westgoten*, pp. 473–490, Würzburg, 1870; A. Ebert, *Geschichte der Litteratur des Mittelalters*, i. 750–751, Leipsic, 1874; P. von Wengen, *Julian, Erzbischof von Toledo*, St. Gall, 1891; R. Hanow, *De Juliano Toletano*, Jena, 1891; *DNB*, iii. 477–481 (exhaustive).

PONCE DE LEON, LUIS DE. See LEON, LUIS DE.

POND, ENOCH: Congregationalist; b. at Wrentham, Mass., July 29, 1791; d. at Bangor, Me., Jan. 21, 1882. He was graduated from Brown University (1813), studied theology under Nathanael Emmons (q.v.), was licensed (1814), and ordained pastor of the Congregational Church in Ward (now Auburn), Mass. (1815). He was editor of *The Spirit of the Pilgrims* (Boston), an orthodox religious monthly which played an important part in the Unitarian controversy (1828–32); professor of systematic theology in the Bangor Theological Seminary (1832–58); professor of ecclesiastical history, lecturer on pastoral theology, and president from 1858 till his death. He was active in the building up of the institution and was a voluminous writer. Among his works are: *Christian Baptism* (Boston, 1817); *Morning of the Reformation* (1842); *The Mather Family* (1844); *Swedenborgianism Examined* (New York, 1861); *The Ancient Church* (1851); *Lectures on Pastoral Theology* (Andover, 1866); *Lectures on Christian Theology* (Boston, 1868); and *A History of God's Church from its Origin to the Present Times* (Hartford, 1871).

PONTIANUS: Pope probably from July 21, 230, to Sept. 28, 235. During his pontificate the circular letter of Demetrius, bishop of Alexandria, condemning Origen, was approved by a synod at Rome (see ORIGEN; and ORIGENISTIC CONTROVERSIES). Pontianus, together with the antipope Hippolytus, was exiled to Sardinia under the persecution of Maximinus Thrax, where he resigned.

(A. HARNACK.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *Liber pontificalis*, ed. L. Duchesne, vol. i., Paris, 1886, ed. T. Mommsen, in *MGH, Gest. pont. Rom.*, i (1898), 24–25; Harnack, *Geschichte*, i. 648, ii. 1, pp. 107 sqq.; Bower, *Popes*, i. 22–23; Platina, *Popes*, i. 43–45; Milman, *Latin Christianity*, i. 80.

PONTIFICAL: In the literal sense of the term, all that pertains to the bishop, especially his vestments and those functions that he alone may perform; more specifically, the term applied by the Roman Catholic Church to the book containing the ritual of those rites which may be celebrated only by bishops or by priests especially delegated by them to act as their representatives. At an early period the Roman Catholic Church took particular pains to prevent any deviations in specifically episcopal functions from the forms usual at Rome; and on Feb. 10, 1596, the new *Pontificale Romanum* was approved, while at the same time all previous pontificals were declared to be superseded. Since, however, this edition was not free from errors, Urban VIII. ordered a new official edition (June 17, 1644) which should be the definitive model for all subsequent copies. The Pontifical was enlarged by Benedict XIV in 1752. The standard edition authorized by Leo XIII. is entitled *Pontificale Romanum a Benedicto XIV et Leone XIII. recognitum et castigatum* (Regensburg, 1898). The Pontifical consists of two parts, the first part containing those rites which relate to persons, and the second those which relate to things.

E. SEHLING.

PONTOPPIDAN, pon-tɔp'pi-dān, ERIK: Danish bishop; b. at Aarhus (on the eastern shore of Jutland) Aug. 24, 1698; d. at Copenhagen Dec. 20, 1764. He was educated at Fredericia (1716–18), after which he was a private tutor in Norway, and then studied in Holland, and at London and Oxford, England. In 1721 he became *informotor* of Frederick Carl of Carlstein (later duke of Plön), and two years later morning preacher in the castle and afternoon preacher at Nordborg. From 1726 to 1734 he was pastor at Hagenberg, where he so protected the pietists as to find it advisable to defend his course against the Lutherans with *Diologus; oder Unterredung Severi, Sinceri, und Simplicis von der Religion und Reinheit der Lehre* (1726) and *Heller Glaubensspiegel* (1727). During this same period he laid the foundation of his later topographical and historical works in *Memoria Hafniæ* (1729); *Theatrum Daniæ* (1736); and *Kurzgefasste Reformationshistorie der dänischen Kirche.* Pontoppidan became successively pastor at Hilleröd and castle preacher at Frederiksborg (1734), Danish court preacher at Copenhagen (1735), professor extraordinary of theology at the University (1738), and a member of the mission board (1740), meanwhile writing his *Everriculum fermenti veteris* (1736) and *Böse Sprichwörter* (1739).

In 1736 Pontoppidan was directed by royal rescript to prepare an explanation of the catechism and a new hymnal, and through these two works—*Wahrheit zur Gottesfurcht* (1737) and the hymnbook (1740)—the pietistic cause in Denmark received powerful assistance. He likewise continued his historical investigations in his *Marmoro Danica* (3 vols., 1739–41; a collection of noteworthy epitaphs and ecclesiastical monuments) and his uncritical *Annales ecclesiæ Danicæ* (4 vols., 1741–52); and also wrote a novel, *Menoza* (3 vols., 1742–43), a critique of the religious conditions of Denmark and other countries. In 1747 he was appointed bishop at Bergen, where he introduced many educational reforms, and wrote *Glossarium Norvagicum* (1749) and *Versuch einer natürlichen Geschichte Norwegens* (Copenhagen, 1752–53), while his pastoral letters formed in part the basis of his later *Collegium pastorale practicum* (1757). The antagonism which Pontoppidan roused at Bergen, however, obliged him to go in 1754 to Copenhagen, where he became prochancellor at the university in the following year. But all his plans in this capacity were thwarted by his opponents, and he sought consolation in writing, the results being his *Origines Hafnienses* (1760) and the first two parts of his *Den danske Atlas* (1763–67), of which the last five volumes were edited posthumously. He was also active as a political economist, being the editor of *Donmarks og Norges ökonomiske Magazin* (8 vols., 1757–64).

(F. NIELSEN†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The literature (in Danish) is indicated in Hauck-Herzog, *RE*, xv. 551.

POOLE, MATTHEW: B. at York, Eng., 1624; educated at Emmanuel College, in Cambridge; he

became minister of St. Michael-le-Quernes, London, in 1648, and devoted himself to the Presbyterian cause. In 1654 he published *The Blasphemer Slain with the Sword of the Spirit,* against John Biddle, the chief Unitarian of that time. In 1658 he published a *Model for the Maintaining of Students,* and raised a fund for their support at the universities. In the same year he published *Quo warranto; or, a moderate Enquiry into the Warrantableness of the Preaching of unordained Persons.* In 1662 he was ejected from his charge, for non-conformity, and devoted himself to Biblical studies. The fruit of these was produced, in 1669, in the *Synopsis Criticorum* (5 vols., folio), a monument of Biblical learning which has served many generations of students, and will maintain its value forever. Many subsequent editions have been published at Frankfort, Utrecht, and elsewhere. He was engaged, at his death, on *English Annotations on the Holy Bible,* and proceeded as far as Isa. lviii. His friends completed the work; and it was published (London, 1685, 2 vols., folio), and passed through many editions. Poole also took part in the Romish controversy, and published two very effective works: *The Nullity of the Romish Faith, or, A Blow at the Root,* etc. (London, 1666), and *Dialogues between a Popish Priest and an English Protestant* (1667). On this account he was greatly hated by the Papists, and his name was on the list of those condemned to death in the Popish Plot. He retired to Amsterdam, and died in Oct., 1679. Few names will stand so high as Poole's in the Biblical scholarship of Great Britain.

C. A. Briggs.

Bibliography: A. à Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses,* ed. P. Bliss, ii. 205, 4 vols., London, 1813–20. A sketch of his life and writings appears in the *English Annotations,* ut sup., vol. iv., Edinburgh, 1801; S. Palmer, *Nonconformist's Memorial,* i. 167, London, 1802; *DNB,* xlvi. 99–100.

POOR CLARES. See Clare (Clara), Saint.

POOR LAWS, HEBREW: Poverty was unknown in the earliest Hebraic age. The nomad has few needs, and those are provided for by the tribe, since pasture-land is common property. Even after the conquest of Canaan there was at first no necessity for legal provision in behalf of the poor. But as soon as the people settled in the cities, the usual results of urban development followed. As the old simplicity disappeared, especially after Saul and David, national independence came in, politics began to have force, property became private, social distinctions arose, and with them the need of protecting the weak from those having the advantage in wealth.

The first efforts in that direction are found in the ancient law known as the Book of the Covenant (Ex. xx.–xxiii.). Very significant are the injunctions regulating the relation between debtor and creditor. To take usury from any of the people was forbidden (Ex. xxii. 25). A garment taken as pledge was to be returned before the sun set for the debtor to use as a covering (Ex. xxii. 26–27). The Hebrew slave was to be set free in the seventh year together with his wife and children (Ex. xxi. 2 sqq.). Field, vineyard, and olive-grove were to lie fallow the seventh year, and all that grew of itself during that year belonged to the poor (Ex. xxiii. 10–12). These enactments were no doubt observed by the right-minded in Israel, but there are reasons for believing that selfishness knew how to evade them. But even where they were observed, they did not suffice to check poverty. Under Solomon Israel began to engage in commerce. The riches which came into the country influenced all conditions of life. Prophets like Hosea, Amos, and Isaiah complained of the luxury of the rich, of their greediness, and of their usurious oppression of the poor. The rich land-owners joined house to house and field to field, till there was no place for the poor (Isa. v. 8, 22 sqq.; Mic. ii. 1 sqq.), and the usurer was not afraid to sell the poor for a trifle (Amos ii. 6–7, cf. iv. 1 sqq., v. 11, viii. 4). Naturally under these circumstances the well-meaning in Israel sought to find new means for the protection of the poor. So the law-book known as Deuteronomy came into existence during the later regal period and its author belonged to the prophetic school of thought. The legislation of Deuteronomy is in part social. Humaneness to the weak, consideration for widows, orphans, Levites, and strangers, are fundamental in the book. Former protective enactments are repealed, new ones are added (cf. Deut. xiv. 28 sqq., xv. 2 sqq., 12 sqq., xxiii. 20, 25–26, xxiv. 6, 10). The great priest-code, which obtained canonical authority after the exile, continued this effort to give protection and relief to the poor (Lev. xix. 9, xxiii. 22, xxv.). But with the decline of the monarchy, the executive authority to carry out these and like regulations vanished, and it is no wonder that they became a dead letter. Aside from laws which were impracticable (Deut. xv. 2 sqq., Lev. xxv. 2 sqq.) other laws were ignored. Such a law was the prohibition of usury, probably often kept, but just as often neglected. Though the immediate result of this legislation was not great, it must not be overlooked that the ideals which it expressed were not in vain. They produced their effects and promoted the knowledge that poverty and riches are differences which do not prevail before God but which as realities afford a field of labor for the highest ethical forces. The declaration of Jesus that the poor (in spirit) are blessed had its root in this legislation, which propounded the principle that the poor in spite of his poverty is a member of the people of God, and on account of it enjoys God's special protection.

(R. Kittel.)

Bibliography: D. Cassel, *Die Armenverwaltung im alten Israel,* Berlin, 1887; F. E. Kübel, *Die soziale . Gesetzgebung des A. T.,* Stuttgart, 1891; W. Nowack, *Die sozialen Probleme in Israel,* Strasburg, 1892; idem, *Archäologie,* i. 350 sqq.; C. H. Cornill, *Das A. T. und die Humanität,* Leipsic, 1895; E. Schall, *Die Staatsverfassung der Juden auf Grund des A. T.,* ib. 1896; E. Day, *Social Life of the Hebrews,* New York, 1901; C. F. Kent, *Students' O. T.,* iv. 126–133, ib. 1907; *DB,* i. 579–580, iv. 19–20, 27–29, 323–326, Extra volume, pp. 357–359; *EB,* iii. 3808–11; *DCG,* ii. 385–386; *JE,* iii. 667–671.

POOR MEN OF CHRIST: Name assumed by the followers of Norbert (see Premonstratensians) and by the Waldenses (q.v.)

POOR MEN OF LYONS. See Waldenses.

POOR RELIEF. See SOCIAL SERVICE OF THE CHURCH.

POPE, PAPACY, PAPAL SYSTEM.

I. Development of the Papacy.
Roman Catholic Theory of the Papacy (§ 1).
Papacy in Pre-Carolingian Times (§ 2).
In Merovingian and Carolingian Periods (§ 3).
Tendency to Absolutism Checked (§ 4).
Spiritual and Temporal Supremacy Claimed (§ 5).
Primacy of Jurisdiction (§ 6).
Primacy of Honor (§ 7).
II. Election of the Pope.
Development of Present Method (§ 1).
The Conclave (§ 2).
The Election (§ 3).
Procedure after Election (§ 4).

I. Development of the Papacy: Pope (Gk., pappas, "father") designates the bishop of Rome in his position as supreme head of the Roman Catholic Church. According to the doctrine of that church, when Christ founded the Church as a visible institution, he assigned to the Apostle Peter the precedency over the other apostles—making Peter his vicar, and constituting him center of the Church in that he conveyed to him alike the supreme priestly authority (see KEYS, POWER OF THE), the supreme doctrinal authority, and the supreme direction of the Church (Matt. xvi. 18, 19; Luke xxii. 32; John xxi. 15–17). But since the Church is a perpetual institution, Peter must needs have a successor, and the ecclesiastical succession is to be secured in that position for all futurity. On account of Peter's connection with the bishopric of Rome, which he is held to have established, this succession, with its derivative rights and titular primacy, is permanently attached to the Roman see; though not, perforce, to its local site in the city of Rome. The succession devolves upon the actual bishop of Rome; and so Peter as vicar of Christ lives on in the Roman bishops, the popes. The doctrines thus outlined are dogmas of the Roman Catholic Church; and therefore they become immutable and fundamental principles of its formal constitution.

1. Roman Catholic Theory of the Papacy.

But in the light of objective historical contemplation, the pope's primacy appears to be solely the product of evolutionary centuries. It is not to be denied that even from the second century and in the third century the Roman congregation and the Roman episcopal see enjoyed a significant and positive esteem in the West. The Roman church not only stood accepted as founded by the Apostle Peter, but was also the sole church in the West which could boast of apostolic establishment, let alone the fact that its site was the pivot of the ancient world, and thus facilitated a vast range of communication with the other churches and congregations. Yet though even so early as in the third century the peculiar distinction and the precedency of the Roman church were based in Rome upon succession to the rights of Peter; nevertheless, not even the Council of Nicæa knows of a Roman primacy over the whole Church. But what really proved of decisive influence in winning legal prerogatives for the Roman bishop were the issues of the dogmatic controversies that agitated the Church from the fourth century forward; since in these controversies the position of the bishop of Rome was of determining weight for the very reason of the high respect enjoyed by his church, because Rome supported the due maintenance of orthodox doctrine. The Synod of Sardica (343) permitted a bishop who had been deposed by the metropolitan synod to appeal to the bishop of Rome. Just as this implied a right of supreme jurisdiction on the part of that dignitary to uphold which appeal could soon be made to the Council of Nicæa, because the decrees of Sardica became consolidated with the canons of that council, so did Innocent I. (404) lay claim to a supreme right of adjudication in all "the more grave and momentous cases"; and about the same time, he claimed the right of issuing obligatory regulations for the several districts of the Church. At the outset, however, these were mere assumptions; nor could the bishops of Rome bring them to practical effect beyond Italy or in such countries as Illyria and southern Gaul, where the local situation happened to be favorable, and where there happened to be voluntary overtures in behalf of close connection with Rome. As a matter of fact, in the year 445, Leo I. obtained of Valentinian III. by an imperial law (*Novellæ Valentiniani*, iii., *tit.* 16), recognition of primacy, in particular that of the supreme judicial and legislative right of the Roman see. However, this law was binding only on the West; and it involved neither a renunciation of the emperor's right of exercising the imperial prerogative to legislate in ecclesiastical affairs, nor any abolishment of the rights of councils convened under imperial authority. It was not by legislation, but principally by interfering in this or that special, important concern that, both before and after this law, the Roman bishop was able to substantiate his assumed supreme control of the Church, and even in the fifth century to play a deciding hand in affairs of the East. Still more significant becomes the status of the Roman bishop from the close of that century, when the Germans found separate kingdoms in Italy. But, at the same time, his local sphere of power became narrowed by the establishment of the Germans in Gaul, Spain, and England; a condition that arrested the progress of the centralizing process already started in those countries.

2. Papacy in Pre-Carolingian Times.

Especially in the most notable of these new states, in Merovingian "France," the direct control of ecclesiastical affairs through the Roman bishop was legally debarred. Anything of that kind could come about only subject to royal approbation, although the pope was acknowledged to be the first bishop in Christendom, and the preservation of communion in the faith with him was accounted indispensable. But the king alone possessed the deciding authority respecting the law of the Church, jointly with the royal or national synod by him convened, the decrees of which could become binding on the state only by the king's approbation. A change in this respect did not set in till in course of the eighth century; when the Carolingian major-

3. In Merovingian and Carolingian Periods.

domos, closely allied as they were with Boniface, endeavored to cooperate in his project of reorganizing and effectually reforming the secularized Frankish church. The same situation persisted under Charlemagne. In the universal Christian commonwealth, such as his empire came to be regarded, he exercised not only the chief temporal sovereignty but also the control of ecclesiastical affairs, though he evinced even greater zeal than his predecessors in assimilating the order of the Frankish church to the Roman canons and praxis. For Charlemagne, the pope ranks merely as the first bishop of Christendom and of the emperor's dominion, who possesses certain prerogatives above the other bishops, and is especially called, in view of his station, to watch over the spiritual side of the Church and over the proper maintenance of its canons and doctrine; yet who may not assume, independently of the emperor, any right of control over the church of the Frankish realm. Several things conspired to bring about a transformation of the earlier situation. These were the weakness of Charlemagne's successors; the political complications provoked through the struggles in the family of Louis the Frank; and the strifes among the Frankish bishops. The imperial and royal power was no longer in a position to preserve intact its ecclesiastical leadership, while the essentially moral influence exercised hitherto by the pope, merged into an encroachment upon ecclesiastical and political ground in proportion as he became repeatedly invoked by the wrangling parties themselves to decide the issue, while they sought to strengthen themselves through his authority. Above all, it was Nicholas I. (858–867) who contrived to employ all these conditions to the furtherance of his policy of subordinating princely and temporal power to the Church, of quashing autonomy of the ecclesiastical primary courts in the various countries, and of vesting deciding control in the bishop of Rome. Pope Nicholas I. found material support for his efforts in the opportunely originated Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals (q.v.) just then coming to the front.

But the dissolution of the Carolingian empire and the resulting confusion which involved even Italy, together with the comparative decline of the papacy, soon hindered the prosecution of that policy.

4. Tendency to Absolutism Checked.

To raise the papacy out of its degradation, there needed nothing less than the renovation of the German empire under Otto I. Indeed, the empire, even as late as the eleventh century, did wield its own sovereignty over the pope and the Church, and at the same time endeavored to reform the Church internally, being supported in this by the bishops whom it had independently invested, who were therefore subservient to the imperial will. The dynasty of Otto did not, indeed, reassert the maxim of the Carolingian civil code, that the supreme authority or power in ecclesiastical matters, especially in legislation, belonged exclusively to the emperor. On the contrary, the house of Otto took practical cognizance of the theory then already established, that just as the universal State had its apex in the German emperor, so the universal Church had its center in the pope. In fine, the emperors disposed of momentous measures in Church administration, such as the creation of new bishoprics, the revival of earlier canon laws, and the execution of reforms in accord with the pope, largely through synods that were held with the pope conjointly. By this policy the emperors cooperated in speeding the way to the general recognition of the pope's primacy in the Church, and to that course of events which began to prevail shortly after the middle of the eleventh century.

About that time there loomed up in Rome the domination of a party in the Church which sought to free it from the influence hitherto exercised by the temporal power; not only to place the guidance of the Church in the hands of the pope, but also to subject the temporal rulers, above all, the German emperor, to the papacy as being the directive secular force, the definitive world power. This party's principal exponent, Hildebrand (see Gregory VII.), assumed as a privilege of the pope to be subject to no judge, and even claimed the right to depose emperors, to bear the imperial insignia, to decree new laws, to hold general councils, to erect new bishoprics, to divide and combine the same, to depose bishops, translate them, consecrate clerics of all churches, receive appeals in all cases, and to have sole decision in all weighty matters of every Church. Under Gregory's leadership of the Curia, and his subsequent pontificate, the influence of the Roman nobility and people upon the papal election became debarred; the imperial right of nomination, with attendant right of confirmation, was abolished; while ecclesiastical reform was accomplished through successive synods convened by the pope alone, and composed of his own loyal supporters. These synods acted as a papal senate, and did away with the imperial synods. Gregory also repeatedly decreed the deposition of bishops, and ultimately annulled the emperor's antecedent right of appointment or investiture to the episcopal sees, over which the conflict issued between the German empire and the papacy (see Investiture), and this terminated in the emancipation of the papacy from the imperial overlordship. So the papacy became the court of last resort in the concerns of the Church, and also strove to win authoritative and leading power in the contemporary civil fabric of Europe. This was achieved under Innocent III.; though at the same time and by the same process the independence or autonomy of the local church tribunals, in particular the episcopal, was broken. Yet the bishops themselves had, for the most part, promoted the policy inaugurated by the Curia in the middle of the eleventh century, although with the undermining of the imperial and princely power they forfeited the essential support of their own freedom in relation to the papacy. The pope, who thereafter was regarded as the vicar of God, or of Christ, and from the time of Innocent III. designates himself as such, laid claim to the supreme sovereignty over the Church and the world alike, though the temporal rule is committed for practical execu-

5. Spiritual and Temporal Supremacy Claimed.

tion to the emperor and other princes subject to the pope's control. In the Church the pope alone commands the supreme and summary power—which exalts him above all accountability before any human judge and above and before a general council. This was claimed not in virtue of the ancient canons, but solely through the dogma of divine right. The pope claimed a general right of dispensation and absolution; he alone could translate and remove bishops; whereas the archbishops and such titular bishops as he consecrated were required to render an oath of obedience patterned after the vassal's oath of allegiance. He heard cases of appeal from all quarters of the Church, and even decided primary cases. He reserved benefices for his own disposal; he assessed particular churches and the clergy for general ecclesiastical objects; and he sent abroad his delegates to all parts of the contemporary Roman Catholic world to carry out his rightful behest, overruling the ordinary local church tribunals. These theories reach their high tide at the beginning of the fourteenth century, are collectively termed the "papal system," and found their classic expression in the much-quoted bull of Bonifacius VIII., *Unam sanctam ecclesiam* (q.v.; text in Reich, *Documents*, pp. 193–195; Eng. transl. in Thatcher and McNeal, *Source Book*, pp. 314–317). At the same period, and primarily in France, the temporal power began to react against the excessive stretch of papal power, and its encroachments upon the temporal jurisdiction, while toward the close of the same century, evoked by the great schism (see Schism) which began in 1378, there cropped out a new trend, the so-called "episcopal" system, canceling or denying the "papal," which was dogmatically rejected by the Vatican Council of 1869–70, and that deliverance has been accepted by the Roman Catholic Church as complete and final.

6. Primacy of Jurisdiction.

The present canon law doctrine distinguishes the pope's rights under two heads, "primacy of jurisdiction" and "primacy of honor." In virtue of the primacy of jurisdiction, there accrues to him the supreme power over the Church in government and leadership; and in the execution of his charge he is bound only by dogma and the divine right. As touching any other law that has force in the Church, he is to respect the same so long as it exists. The most important rights involved in the primacy are the supreme right of legislation; the supreme direction and final decision of matters affecting ecclesiastical offices; the supreme judicial competency in cases of dispute, correction, discipline; regulation of the various religious institutions, particularly the orders and congregations; the supreme control of the ecclesiastical exchequer and assets of property; the right to uphold unity in the liturgy, as also in the administration of the sacraments and use of sacramentals; to direct the festivals in the Church at large; the right of beatification and canonization; the right of according indulgences and regulating fasts; and that of reserving for himself the absolution from sins pertaining to the sphere of conscience. Furthermore, the primacy carries with it the supreme doctrinal authority. And when the pope voices his decisions in this respect, speaking or publishing *ex cathedra;* when in virtue of his apostolic authority as pastor and teacher of all Christians he defines a proposition affecting faith or morals in the interests of the whole Church, his pronouncements are then informed with infallibility by reason of divine assistance, without need of any further assent on the part of the Church, as in a general council (in the *Constitutio Vaticana* of July 18, 1870, the bull *Pastor æternus*, iv.). It is in virtue of this doctrinal authority that he can issue spiritual decrees in the cause of enlarging the dogma, and of defining questionable dogmatic subjects; that he can condemn errors of doctrine, institute and direct missions, found educational establishments, and watch over the instruction therein dispensed. According to this "Vatican Constitution" the pope is not only empowered to exercise all these rights which his primacy conveys, in the manner of a supreme court, but he is also, by virtue of the same primacy, the universal bishop in all the Church. That is, he has an immediate, complete and canonical episcopal power over all churches, dioceses, and believers. For although it is an exaggerated statement to say, as do the Old Catholics, that under this Vatican dogma the bishops have become legally dwarfed into mere vicars or attorneys of the pope, yet the Ultramontanists may deny that any change whatever has been brought about in the status of the bishops by force of the *Vaticanum*. While the Vatican Council by no means put aside the episcopal office as a distinct, or "independent" office, yet the bishops are in fact reduced to the same position as the vicars dependent on the pope directly. Owing to his supreme directive authority over the Church, the pope also represents the Church abroad, particularly in relation to civil governments, and this with a standing recognized in international law. But this is not to imply that, even in the states where Roman Catholics are in the majority, he enjoys a sovereignty over Roman Catholic citizens on like terms with the civil power; nor that his position in respect to civil governments is to be deemed equivalent to that between two independent sovereigns and states.

7. Primacy of Honor.

The pope's "primacy of honor" finds expression as follows: (1) In certain specified designations, titles, and forms of address appertaining to him alone: such as *papa*, *pontifex maximus*, or *summus pontifex; vicarius Petri*, *vicarius Dei* or *Christi; servus servorum Dei;* and in the forms of address, *Sanctitas tua*, or *vestra*, or *sanctissime pater*. (2) In the insignia of the papal dignity: the tiara, a headdress evolved from the combination of miter and crown, with three golden bands about the miter; the *pedum rectum* (straight pastoral staff); and the pallium, which, in distinction from the archbishops, he wears at all times and places, when officiating at mass. (3) The pope is entitled to the so-called *adoratio*, the homage due to him by the faithful in genuflection and kissing the papal foot, now restricted solely to ceremonious audiences and formal acts of homage; while with ruling princes, it consists merely in kissing his hand. Apart from

his position as leader of all the Church, the pope is coincidently bishop of Rome, also archbishop of the church province of Rome, primate of Italy, and patriarch of the West. Finally, the pope was also temporal sovereign of the Papal States (q.v.), while they existed, and as such he occupied, in view of international law, the highest rank among Roman Catholic princes.

II. Election of the Pope: In early times the bishop of Rome, like the diocesan of any other see, was chosen by the local clergy and people, assisted by neighboring bishops. Later the Roman emperors and the Ostrogothic kings exercised an influence, particularly in deciding disputed elections.

1. Development of Present Method. After the fall of the Ostrogothic kingdom in Italy, vacancy of the see of Rome was formally announced to the exarch at Ravenna, and a new pope was elected, usually on the third day after the burial of the former pontiff, by the clergy, the nobles, and the people of Rome. The exarch, after receiving the official report of the election, secured the approbation of the emperor, whereupon the newly elected pope was duly consecrated. During the decline of Lombard power in Italy, secular rulers exercised no supervision over papal elections, and at the Lateran synod of 769 the laity were restricted to mere acclamation of an election made by the clergy and to confirming the protocol. While the story that Adrian I. conferred on Charlemagne the privilege of filling the papal throne is now acknowledged to be untrue, it is still a moot question whether the Frankish kings and emperors were merely informed by a new pontiff of his election and consecration, or could confirm the election and require an oath of fealty. It is certain, however, that after 824 a new pope was usually consecrated only after taking the oath of allegiance to the emperor, while the Roman council of 898 enacted that a pontiff should be consecrated only in the presence of imperial envoys.

With the restoration of the Holy Roman Empire (q.v.) by Otto I. the Romans were obliged to promise that no pope should be elected or consecrated without the approval of himself or his son, thus giving the emperors an influence on papal elections which was hitherto unprecedented. Though the old forms were preserved, the election became a mere form of choosing the candidate designated by the emperor, this power being held, despite all efforts of the Roman nobility, until the death of Henry III. in 1056. At the Roman Synod of 1059, however, Nicholas II. issued a decree which placed the election in the hands of the cardinal bishops, aided by the other cardinals, while the remaining clergy and the laity were allowed only the privilege of acclamation. The king, on the other hand, received from Nicholas the right of confirming subsequent elections, or at least of vetoing undesirable candidates before election. This arrangement proved impracticable, however, and at the third Lateran council, in 1179, Alexander III., tacitly presupposing in the abrogation of imperial prerogatives the absence of any share of clergy and laity in papal elections, enacted that the vote of two-thirds of all the college of cardinals was necessary for the lawful election of a pope. This forms the basis of the present laws governing papal elections, the principal supplements and modifications being enactments of the second council of Lyons (1274) and Clement V (1311?), and the constitutions of Clement VI. (1351), Julius II. (1505), Pius IV (1562), Gregory XV. (*Æterni patris* of 1621, and the *Cœremoniale in electione Romani pontificis observandum* of the same year), Urban VIII. (1626), and Clement XII. (1732).

Until the most recent regulations under Pius X. (q.v.), after the pope's death, the next ten days are devoted to preparations for the funeral ceremony and to preliminaries of the election; especially to

2. The Conclave. the institution of the conclave. This interim serves at the same time to enable cardinals at a distance to reach Rome for participation in the election. The conclave, an apartment in which the cardinals must proceed with the election guarded and excluded from the outer world (which they are not allowed to leave before the election is completed), is made ready in the Vatican, and comprises a chapel (for the elective transaction), together with a suite of halls in which cells are fitted up for the cardinals' and the conclavists' lodgings. The conclavists are persons who have to attend the cardinals in the conclave; such as their servants, two physicians, a sacrist, two masons and carpenters, and others. The cardinals and conclavists occupy this apartment on the eleventh day, after a solemn high office. Hereupon the constitutions on papal election are read forth, and sworn to by the cardinals, and the conclavists are sworn in. At evening, all unauthorized persons must leave the conclave; and now the entrances are all walled shut except one, through which food for the persons in the conclave is daily introduced; and this one entrance is strictly guarded.

For participation in the election, only those cardinals are of qualified authority who have received consecration to the diaconate. Neither is such a

3. The Election. one debarred by excommunication, suspension, or interdict. Absentees can deliver their vote neither by letter nor by substitute. Theoretically every Catholic male Christian, even a layman, who has not lapsed into heresy, is eligible. But since Urban VI. (1378–89), previously archbishop of Bari, none but a cardinal has been elected (cf. G. Berthelet, *Muss der Papst ein Italiener sein?* Leipsic, 1894). The states of Austria, France, and Spain have the right, for each state as affecting one candidate, of declaring a cardinal passively ineligible; but the election of an " excluded " candidate can not be challenged. In regard to the election itself, it is forbidden, under penalty of forfeited vote, to engage in " electioneering." Every cardinal present is bound, under pain of excommunication, to take part in the business of election, which is in order twice a day, forenoon and afternoon, till the result be achieved. Where voters are sick and unable to leave their cells, their vote is of necessity sent for, and this by the hand of cardinals expressly selected for the purpose by lot. The only admissible kinds of election are (a), the *electio quasi per inspirationem*, election by ac-

clamation; (b) the *electio per compromissum*, in which the cardinals, instead of electing the pope in a body, unanimously transfer the elective prerogative to a specified quorum of their colleagues (two at least), and then instruct them in detail as to the steps next to be observed in the matter: for instance, whether unanimity or simply majority shall be required; save that no unlawful forms, e.g., election by lot, are allowed to be adopted; (c) the *electio per scrutinium*, or by ballot. In this case all the electors must write the name of their candidate on one of the specially prepared voting tickets, containing printed directions and to be folded; which ballots they must deposit in order in a chalice upon the altar, within view of the three appointed scrutineers. Next follows the counting of the ballots. Should their number fail to tally with that of the cardinals present, the balloting must be stopped, and the votes are burned. Otherwise the result of the voting is reckoned up, and the election is ended —provided a candidate has received more than the requisite two-thirds majority. Should it so happen, however, that he has received only just that majority, it is ascertained by opening his ballot whether he has not cast his vote for himself; which is against the rules and nullifies the election. Ballots containing the names of several candidates are void. Where the balloting fails to yield the prescribed majority for some one of the candidates, a special procedure is still in order, the so-called *accessus*, with the object of testing whether a contingent of the voters will not surrender their candidates and declare themselves for one of the others. This amounts to a supplementary balloting to the first ballot: in other words, the votes already cast stand effectual, and the *accessit* votes are counted with them. In order that a result may be reached by this process, and yet that the vote of the individual voter shall not be twice counted for his candidate, the following regulations are in force with the *accessit* balloting. No one is allowed to repeat his vote in the *accessit*, in favor of the candidate whom he has already named in the ballot, but he can retain his choice by writing on his ticket, *Accedo nemini*. Nor can any one receive a vote of *accessit* who has not yet been nominated in the original balloting. If the *accessit* yields no result, the whole act of election stops, and the balloting must be begun anew at the next elective session. More than one *accessit* is inadmissible.

Pius X., who was elected in consequence of employment of the *exclusiva* (see EXCLUSION, RIGHT OF), through the constitution *Commissum nobis* of Jan. 20, 1904, prohibited the cardinals, under penalty of excommunication, to allow in the future the veto of any government, even though expressed merely in the form of a wish. Thus the *exclusiva* is abolished. It is not yet known what attitude the affected states will take in the matter. Through the constitution *Vacante sede apostolica* of Dec. 25, 1904, this pope regulated the entire course of papal election and at the same time introduced the following innovations: the funeral rites for a deceased pope are to last nine days, after which the cardinals shall enter the conclave. But on the day after the death of the pope the first session of the Holy College is to be held, the rules for papal election in the conclave are to be read, and the oath of the cardinals and conclavists is taken. If the balloting leads to no result, there takes place no accessory meeting, but a second balloting, under the same conditions as the first. Simony no longer nullifies election. Directions concerning the feeding of conclavists are wanting, hence the rule of Leo XIII. concerning the erection of kitchens within the conclave chambers remains unchanged. Secrecy after the end of the conclave in respect to official affairs is specially enjoined.

4. Procedure after Election.

The elected candidate, upon confirmation of the result of the election, is solemnly asked by the subdean whether he accepts the election. With the acceptance, he receives the papal office. At the same time, and in accordance with a custom constantly in effect since the eleventh century, he announces what name he will bear as pope. Thereupon the elected candidate is robed with the papal vestments, and now begins their first adoration on the part of the cardinals. Meanwhile the sealing of the conclave has been canceled, and the first cardinal deacon forthwith proclaims to the people the proper name and papal name of the new pope. In the afternoon of the same day there ensues first in the Sistine Chapel and then in Saint Peter's the second and third adoration on the cardinals' part, this time in public. If the pope elect is not as yet dignified with the episcopal consecration, but only with one of the lower grades of consecration, he receives the orders which are still owing to him inclusive of the priestly consecration, by the office of one of the cardinal bishops. The episcopal consecration, which in former times was performed coincidently with the coronation, is now usually appointed on a Sunday or festival preceding. It is consummated by the dean of the college of cardinals. If the pope elect was of episcopal rank already, then a benediction takes the place of consecration. After the consecration or benediction, there follows the coronation by the dean of the cardinal deacons with the triple crown in Saint Peter's, and on some subsequent day the formal occupancy of the Vatican.

Incumbency of the papal chair by any other process than that of election by the cardinals is not recognized by the present positive canon of the Roman Catholic Church; and in particular it is held to be unlawful for the ruling pope to appoint his own successor; although attempts of that kind repeatedly came about in former centuries, and although the competency of the pope to alter the prevalent law in this respect can hardly be doubted.

E. SEHLING.

COMPLETE LIST OF THE POPES.

According to the claim of the Roman Catholic Church the Apostle Peter was the first pope and reigned from 41 to 67.

(67–79?)	Linus
(79–91?)	Cletus, or Anacletus
(91–100?)	Clemens I.
(101–109?)	Evarestus
(109–119)	Alexander I.
119–126	Sixtus I.
? 128–137	Telesphorus
? 138–142	Hyginus
? 142–156	Pius I.

? 157–167	Anicetus
? 168–176	Soter
? 177–189	Eleutherus
? 190–202	Victor I.
202–217	Zephyrinus
218–222	Calixtus or Callistus I. (Hippolytus, Antipope)
? 222–230	Urbanus I.
? 230–235	Pontianus (resigned in exile)
235–236	Anterus
236–250	Fabianus, Martyr
? 251–252	Cornelius (in exile)
? 251	(Novatianus, Antipope)
252–253	Lucius I.
? 253–257	Stephen I.
? 257–258	Sixtus II.
259–269	Dionysius
269–274	Felix I.
275–283	Eutychianus
283–296	Caius
296–304	Marcellinus
307–309	Marcellus
? 309	Eusebius, d. Sept. 26 (?), 309
310–314	Miltiades (Melchiades)
314–335	Silvester I.
336	Marcus
337–352	Julius I.
352–366	Liberius
355–366	Filix II., Antipope
366	Ursinus, Antipope
366–384	Damasus
384–398	Siricius
398–402	Anastasius
402–417	Innocent I.
417–418	Zosimus
418, Dec. 27	[Eulalius, Antipope]
418–422	Boniface I.
422–432	Celestine I.
432–440	Sixtus III.
440–461	Leo I.
461–468	Hilary
468–483	Simplicius
483–492	Felix III.
492–496	Gelasius I.
496–498	Anastasius II.
498–514	Symmachus
498, Nov.	Laurentius, Antipope
514–523	Hormisdas
523–526	John I.
526–530	Felix IV.
530–532	Boniface II.
530, Sept. 17	Dioscorus, Antipope
532–535	John II. Mercurius
535–536	Agapetus I.
536–538	Silverius (exiled)
537–555	Vigilius
555–560	Pelagius I.
560–573	John III.
574–578	Benedict I.
578–590	Pelagius II.
590–604	St. Gregory I. (the Great)
604–606	Sabinianus
607	Boniface III.
608–615	Boniface IV.
615–618	Deusdedit
619–625	Boniface V.
625–638	Honorius I.
640	Severinus
640–642	John IV.
642–649	Theodorus I.
649–655	St. Martin I. (exiled in 654)
654–657	Eugenius I.
657–672	Vitalianus
672–676	Adeodatus
676–678	Donus or Domnus I.
678–681	Agatho
682–683	Leo II.
684–685	Benedict II.
685–686	John V.
686–687	Conon
687–692	Paschal, Antipope
687	Theodorus, Antipope
687–701	Sergius I.
701–705	John VI.
705–707	John VII.
708	Sisinnius
708–715	Constantine I.
715–731	Gregory II.
731–741	Gregory III.
741–752	Zacharias
752 (3 days)	Stephen II.
752–757	Stephen III.
757–767	Paul I.
767–788	Constantine II.
768–772	Stephen IV.
772–795	Adrian I.
795–816	Leo III.
816–817	Stephen V.
817–824	Paschal I.
824–827	Eugenius II.
827 (40 days)	Valentinus
827–844	Gregory IV.
844–847	Sergius II.
847–855	Leo IV.
855–858	Benedict III.
855	Anastasius
858–867	Nicholas I.
867–872	Adrian II.
872–882	John VIII.
882–884	Marinus
884–885	Adrian III.
885–891	Stephen VI.
891–896	Formosus
896 (15 days)	Boniface VI.
896–897	Stephen VII.
897 (4 months)	Romanus
897	Theodorus II.
898–900	John IX.
900–903	Benedict IV.
903 (1 month)	Leo V
903–904	Christopher
904–911	Sergius III.
911–913	Anastasius III.
913–May, 914	Lando
914–929	John X. *
928–929	Leo VI.
929–931	Stephen VIII.
931–936	John XI.
936–939	Leo VII.
939–942	Stephen IX.
942–946	Marinus II.
946–955	Agapetus
955–964	John XII.†
963–965	Leo VIII.
964–965	Benedict V.
965–972	John XIII.
973–974	Benedict VI.
974–983	Benedict VII.
983–984	John XIV.
984–985	Boniface VII.
985–996	John XV.
996–999	Gregory V.
997–998	John XVI.
999–1003	Silvester II.
1003	John XVII.
1003–1009	John XVIII.
1009–1012	Sergius IV.
1012–1024	Benedict VIII.
1012	Gregory VI., Antipope
1024–1033	John XIX.
1033–1045	Benedict IX. (deposed)
1045–1046	Silvester III.
1044–1046	Gregory VI.
1046–1047	Clement II.
1048	Damasus II.
1049–1054	Leo IX.
1055–1057	Victor II.
1057–1058	Stephen X. (deposed)
1058–1059	Benedict X.
1059–1061	Nicholas II.
1061–1073	Alexander II.
1061	Cadalus (Honorius II.), Antipope
1073–1085	Gregory VII. (Hildebrand)
1080–1100	Wibertus (Clement III.)
1086–1087	Victor III.

* d. in prison after supersession
† removed 963.

1088–1099	Urban **II.**
1099–1118	Paschal II.
1100	Theodoricus, Antipope
1102	Albertus, Antipope
1105–1111	Silvester IV., Antipope
1118–1119	Gelasius **II.**
1118–1121	Gregory VIII., Antipope
1119–1124	Calixtus II.
1124	Theobaldus Buccapecus (Celestine), Antipope
1124–1130	Honorius II.
1130–1143	Innocent II.
1130–1138	Anacletus II.
1138	Victor IV., Antipope
1143–1144	Celestine II.
1144–1145	Lucius II.
1145–1153	Eugenius III.
1153–1154	Anastasius IV.
1154–1159	Adrian IV
1159–1181	Alexander III.
1159–1164	Victor IV., Antipope
1164–1168	Paschal III., Antipope
1168–1178	Calixtus III., Antipope
1178–1180	Innocent III., Antipope
1181–1185	Lucius III.
1185–1187	Urban III.
1187	Gregory **VIII.**
1187–1191	Clement **III.**
1191–1198	Celestine **III.**
1198–1216	Innocent **III.**
1216–1227	Honorius **III.**
1227–1241	Gregory **IX.**
1241	Celestine IV.
1243–1254	Innocent IV.
1254–1261	Alexander IV.
1261–1264	Urban IV.
1265–1268	Clement IV.
1271–1276	Gregory X.
1276	Innocent V.
1276	Adrian V.
1276–1277	John **XXI.**
1277–1280	Nicholas **III.**
1281–1285	Martin IV.
1285–1287	Honorius IV.
1288–1292	Nicholas IV.
1294	St. Celestine V. (abdicated)
1294–1303	Boniface VIII.
1303–1304	Benedict XI.
1305–1314	Clement V.*
1316–1334	John **XXII.**
1334–1342	Benedict XII.
1342–1352	Clement VI.
1352–1362	Innocent VI.
1362–1370	Urban V.
1370–1378	Gregory XI.
1378–1389	Urban VI.
1378–1394	Clement VII.
1389–1404	Boniface **IX.**
1394–1423	Benedict **XIII.** (deposed 1409)
1404–1406	Innocent VII.
1406–1415	Gregory XII. (deposed 1409)
1409–1410	Alexander V.
1410–1415	John **XXIII.** (deposed)
1417–1431	Martin V.
1417	Clement **VIII.**
1431–1447	Eugene IV.
1439–1449	Felix V
1447–1455	Nicholas V.
1455–1458	Calixtus III.
1458–1464	Pius II.
1464–1471	Paul II.
1471–1484	Sixtus IV.
1484–1492	Innocent VIII.
1492–1503	Alexander VI.
1503	Pius III.
1503–1513	Julius II.
1513–1521	Leo X.
1522–1523	Adrian VI.
1534–1532	Clement VII.
1534–1549	Paul **III.**
1550–1555	Julius III.
1555	Marcellus **II.**
1555–1559	Paul IV.
1559–1565	Pius **IV.**
1566–1572	Pius V.
1572–1585	Gregory **XIII.**
1585–1590	Sixtus V.
1590	Urban **VII.**
1590–1591	Gregory **XIV.**
1591	Innocent **IX.**
1592–1605	Clement **VIII.**
1605	Leo **XI.**
1605–1621	Paul V.
1621–1623	Gregory XV.
1623–1644	Urban VIII.
1644–1655	Innocent **X.**
1655–1667	Alexander **VII.**
1667–1669	Clement **IX.**
1670–1676	Clement **X.**
1676–1689	Innocent XI.
1689–1691	Alexander **VIII.**
1691–1700	Innocent **XII.**
1700–1721	Clement **XI.**
1721–1724	Innocent **XIII.**
1724–1730	Benedict **XIII.**
1730–1740	Clement **XII.**
1740–1758	Benedict **XIV.**
1758–1769	Clement **XIII.**
1769–1774	Clement **XIV.**
1775–1799	Pius VI.
1800–1823	Pius VII.
1823–1829	Leo XII.
1829–1830	Pius VIII.
1831–1846	Gregory **XVI.**
1846–1878	Pius IX. (longest reign)
1878–1903	Leo XIII.
1903	Pius X.

* Clement V moved the papal see to Avignon in 1309; and his successors continued to reside there for seventy years, till Gregory **XI.** After that date arose a forty-years' schism between the Roman popes and the Avignon popes.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: For the details of the development of the papacy as for a mass of literature the reader is referred to the articles on the various popes and the bibliographies attached. The chief sources are indicated, as well as the leading treatises, in vol. i., pp. xxii.–xxiii. of this work, where are noted the histories of the popes by Mann, Pastor, Creighton, Von Ranke, Nielsen, Gregorovius, Bower, Milman, and Mirbt: not to be overlooked is the literature under such articles as INFALLIBILITY; INVESTITURE; TRENT, COUNCIL OF; and ULTRAMONTANISM. The sources are in the *Liber pontificalis;* Jaffé, *Regesta;* J. M. Watterich, *Romanorum pontificum vitæ*, 2 vols., Leipsic, 1862; A. Potthast, *Regesta pontificum Romanorum*, parts i.–xii., Berlin, 1873–75; *Regesta Pontificum romanorum*, ed. P. F. Kehr, vols., i.–iv., Berlin, 1906–09; and the various collections of bulls, briefs, and the like. A fine lot of original documents is massed in Reich, *Documents*, pp. 127–245, and others are scattered in other parts of the work; translations of many of these are found in Thatcher and McNeal, *Source Book*, pp. 83–256, 309–340; also, in Henderson, *Documents*, pp. 267 sqq.; and in F. A. Ogg, *Source Book of Mediæval History*, pp. 78 sqq., 261 sqq., 380 sqq.

For the history of the papacy in its various relations consult: F. Maassen, *Der Primat des Bischofs von Rom und die alten Patriarchalkirchen*, Bonn, 1853; T. Greenwood, *Cathedra Petri: a political History of the great Latin Patriarchate*, 6 vols., London, 1856–72; A. Westermayer, *Das Papstthum in den ersten 500 Jahren*, Schaffhausen, 1867–69; A. von Reumont, *Geschichte der Stadt Rom*, 3 vols., Berlin, 1867–70; R. Baxmann, *Die Politik der Papste*, 2 vols., Elberfeld, 1868–69; E. Dumont, *La Papauté, les premiers empereurs chrétiens et les premiers conciles généraux*, Paris, 1877; P. Lanfrey, *Hist. politique des papes*, new ed., Paris, 1880; B. Jungmann, *Dissertationes selectæ*, 5 vols., Regensburg, 1880–85; A. R. Pennington, *Epochs of the Papacy*, London, 1881; F. Rocquain, *La Papauté au moyen âge*, Paris, 1881; W. von Gieselbrecht, *Geschichte der deutschen Kaiserzeit*, 6 vols., Brunswick, 1881 sqq.; J. Langen, *Geschichte der römischen Kirche*, 4 vols., Bonn, 1881–93; F. Gregorovius, *Geschichte des Stadt Rom im Mittelalter*, 8 vols., Stuttgart, 1886–96, Eng. transl., London, 1895–1902; M. Souchon, *Die Papstwahlen von Bonifaz VIII. bis Urban VI.*, Brunswick, 1888; H. Dopffel, *Kaisertum und Papstwechsel unter den Karolingern*, Freiburg, 1889; R. F. Littledale, *The Petrine Claims*, London, 1889; J. J. I. von Döllinger,

Das Papstthum, new ed., Munich, 1892; H. Wilfrid, *Die Geschichte der Päpste*, Basel, 1894; G. Goyau, *Le Vatican, les papes et la civilisation*, Brussels, 1895; W. Bright, *The Roman See in the Early Church, and Other Studies*, London, 1896; C. Locke, *Age of the Great Western Schism*, New York, 1896; M. R. Vincent, *The Age of Hildebrand*, New York, 1896; L. Duchesne, *Les Premiers Temps de l'état pontifical, 754–1073*, Paris, 1898; Eng. transl., *The Beginnings of the Temporal Sovereignty of the Popes, 754–1073*, London, 1908; L. Rivington, *The Roman Primacy, A.D. 430–451*, London, 1899; T. F. Tout, *The Empire and the Papacy, 918–1273*, London, 1899, new ed., ib. 1901; F. Fournier, *Le Papauté devant l'histoire*, 2 vols., Paris, 1899–1900; F. Nippold, *Papacy in the 19th Century*, New York, 1900; F. W. Pullen, *The Primitive Saints and the See of Rome*, London, 1900; K. D. Beste, *The Victories of Rome and the Temporal Monarchy of the Church*, London, 1901; H. Bouvier, *Le Governement de l'église de Rome de la fin du première siècle jusqu'au milieu du troisième*, Montébeliard, 1901; W. Miller, *Mediæval Rome, 1078–1600*, London, 1901; F. von Bach, *Geschichte der Papste vom Beginne . . bis zu Gregor XVI.*, Bamberg, 1902; W. Barry, *The Papal Monarchy from Gregory the Great to Boniface VIII., 590–1303*, London. 1902; A. D. Greenwood, *Empire and Papacy in the Middle Ages*, London, 1902; J. Maitre, *Les Papes et la papauté d'après la prophetie attribuée a Saint Malachie*, Paris, 1902; *Cambridge Modern History*, vol. 1, vi. 536 sqq., Cambridge, 1902–09; W. Norden, *Das Papsttum und Byzanz*, Berlin, 1903; F. von Thudichum, *Papsttum und Reformation im Mittelalter, 1143–1517*, Leipsic, 1903; B. Labanca, *Il Papato. Sua origine, sue lotte e vicende, suo avvenire*, Turin, 1905; G. Krüger, *Das Papsttum. Seine Idee und ihre Träger*, Tübingen, 1907, Eng. transl., *The Papacy*, London, 1909; J. Turmel, *Histoire du dogme de la papauté des origines a la fin du quatrième siècle*, Paris, 1908; J. J. Walsh, *The Popes and Science; the History of the Papal Relations to Science during the Middle Ages and down to our Time*, New York, 1908; G. Bartoli, *The Primitive Church and the Primacy of Rome*, London, 1909; T. S. Dolan, *The Papacy and the First Councils of the Church*, St. Louis, 1910; A. C. Jennings, *The Mediæval Church and the Papacy*, London, 1909; W. J. Simpson, *Papal Infallibility and its Roman Catholic Opponents*, London, 1909; G. F. Young, *The Medici*, 2 vols., New York, 1910; W. E. Beet, *The Rise of the Papacy, A.D. 385–461*, London, 1910; H. Koch, *Cyprian und der römische Primat*, Leipsic, 1910; J. Schnitzer, *Hat Jesus das Papsttum gestiftet*, Augsburg, 1910; J. S. Vaughan, *The Purpose of the Papacy*, London, 1910; and the works on church history, e.g., Schaff, *Christian Church*, ii. 154 sqq., iii. 299 sqq., iv. 203 sqq., v. passim, vi. 252 sqq.

On elections consult: W. C. Cartwright, *On Papal Conclaves*, Edinburgh, 1868; R. Zöpffell, *Die Papstwahlen und die mit ihnen im nächsten Zusammenhange stehenden Ceremonien in ihrer Entwickelung*, Göttingen, 1872; O. Lorenz, *Papstwahl und Kaiserthum*, Berlin, 1874; M. Heimbucher, *Die Papstwahlen unter den Karolingern*, Augsburg, 1889; A. R. Pennington, *The Papal Conclaves*, London, 1897; H. J. Wurm, *Die Papstwahl. Ihre Geschichte und Gebräuche*, Cologne, 1902; G. Berthelet, *Conclavi pontefici e cardinali nel secolo*, Turin, 1903; P. Herre, *Papsttum und Papstwahle im Zeitalter Philipps II.*, Leipsic, 1907 (important).

POPE, WILLIAM BURT: Methodist; b. at Horton, N. S., Feb. 19, 1822; d. at Hendon, London, July 5, 1903. He studied theology at Richmond College, England; was a Methodist pastor (1841–67); and professor of theology in Didsbury College, Manchester, from 1867. He published *The Words of the Lord Jesus*, a translation from the German of R. E. Stier (10 vols.; Edinburgh, 1855, and later); *Discourses on the Kingdom and Reign of Christ* (London, 1869); *The Person of Christ* (Fernley Lecture, 1875; later ed., 1899); *A Compendium of Christian Theology* (3 vols.; 1875–76); *Discourses, chiefly on the Lordship of the Incarnate Redeemer* (1880); *Sermons, Addresses, and Charges of a Year* (1878); and *A Higher Catechism of Theology* (1883).

PORDAGE, JOHN: English mystic; b. at London 1607; d. there Dec., 1681. He studied theology and medicine at Oxford, probably without taking a degree, at least in course. In 1644 he became curate of St. Lawrence, Reading, and in 1647 was made rector of Bradfield, Berkshire, being apparently recommended chiefly by his knowledge of astrology. He soon began to examine English translations of Jakob Böhme, and on the night of Jan. 3, 1651, received a number of visions, to the reality of which his wife testified. A band of about twenty quickly gathered around the two visionaries, and for some three weeks there was no cessation of apparitions. Under the Commonwealth, Pordage was accused of heresy, the charges involving a sort of mystical pantheism, but he was acquitted on Mar. 27, 1651. The accusations were renewed, however, by the Presbyterians John Tickel and Christopher Fowler, and on Dec. 8, 1654, Pordage was ejected as "ignorant and very insufficient for the work of the ministry." He was reinstated in 1663, but about 1670 seems to have retired to London, where he spent the remainder of his life.

About 1652 Pordage became acquainted with Jane Lead (q.v.), introducing her to Böhme's mysticism, and being won in turn as her adherent by her own visions. In Dec., 1671, he received new revelations, in which his spirit, detached from sense and reason, was translated to the mountain of eternity; and this experience evidently formed the basis of his system of mysticism. Though deeply influenced by astrology and alchemy, Pordage, like Böhme, sought to make room in his speculative system for everything essential in Biblical revelation. In God he recognizes the being of all beings, and the primal cause of all causes. The Father is the generator of the Son, or Word, who constitutes the center, or heart, of the Trinity. The Holy Ghost is the life and force which executes the will of the Father through the Son. Next comes the cosmic sphere of eternity with three distinct categories of space: outer court, sanctuary, and holy of holies. In the center of this sphere, God's residence proper, dwells the eye that represents God himself; in the outer court it is closed; in the sanctuary, open; in the holy of holies, revealed with full splendor. The body of God, moreover, is eternal cloud, and its outline that of Noah's ark.

An important place is assigned in Pordage's scheme to a kind of intermediate being termed Sophia, or heavenly wisdom, which he regarded as the radiance from the eye of eternity, and as the consort and attendant of the Trinity. He likewise affirmed a series of emanations or spirits possessed of the same substance as the Godhead. A lower sphere is occupied by the eternal spirits of angels and men; but while Adam's eternal spirit bore the spirits of his sons, the souls and bodies of angels and men are not immediately from God, but created from the essence of eternal nature. This eternal nature was not born of God, as was the eternal world, but was created by him from the divine chaos which concealed within itself the forces of the worlds. He also taught a coalescence of the inner man with the transfigured person of Christ, and had no sympathy with conditions in the Church of his time.

The principal works of Pordage were as follows: *Truth appearing through the Clouds of undeserved Scandal* (London, 1655); *Innocency appearing through the dark Mists of pretended Guilt* (1655); *A just Narrative of the Proceedings of the Commissioners of Berks against John Pordage* (1655); and the posthumous *Theologia Mystica, or the Mystic Divinitie of the Æternal Indivisible* (anonymous; 1683). From his manuscripts was translated *Vier Tractätlein Von der Aeusseren Gebuhrt und Fleischwerdung Jesu Christi Von der Mystischen und innern Gebuhrt Vom Geiste des Glaubens Experimentale Entdeckungen von Vereinigung der Naturen, Essenzen, Tincturen, Leiber* (Amsterdam, 1704). A number of other works never published in English are mentioned in an advertisement appended to Jane Lead's *Fountain of Gardens* (London, 1697; cf. *DNB*, xlvi. 151).

A. RÜEGG.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The primal sources for a biography are Pordage's own writings, ut sup., cf. C. Fowler, *Dæmonium meridianum. Being a Relation of the Proceedings of the Commissioners against J. Pordage. With some Animadversions upon a Book of . . . J. Pordage*, London, 1655. Consult further: G. Arnold, *Unparteyische Kirchen- und Ketzerhistorie*, iv. 915, Frankfort, 1715; P Poiret, *Bibliotheca mysticorum selecta*, p. 174, Amsterdam, 1708; A. à Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses*, ed. P. Bliss, iii. 1098, iv. 405, 715, 4 vols., London, 1817–20; *DNB*, xlvi. 150–151.

PORETE, MARGARETA. See FREE SPIRIT, BRETHREN OF THE, § 3.

PORPHYRY: Bishop of Gaza; b. at Thessalonica c. 347; d. at Gaza Feb. 26, 420. After spending five years in the Scetic desert in Egypt, he passed an equal period in Palestine under privations which impaired his health, visiting the sacred sites and living in Jerusalem, where Bishop Praylius ordained him presbyter and made him custodian of the wood of the cross. Early in 395 he was consecrated bishop of Gaza, where he increased the scanty number of Christians, but at the same time met with bitter pagan opposition, so that he twice appealed to the court to close and destroy the heathen temples; first (398) through his deacon Marcus, and second (401–402) in person together with the archbishop of Cæsarea. The temple of the god Marnas was especially offensive to the Christians, and on his second appeal the intervention of the Empress Eudoxia secured the destruction of the shrine. On the site was erected a magnificent church, the Eudoxiana.

(E. HENNECKE.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The *Vita*, by the deacon Marcus, was edited with commentary by M. Haupt for the Berlin Academy, in the *Abhandlungen*, 1874, pp. 171–215, and published separately, 1875; it is also in *ASB*, Feb., iii. 643–661; in *MPG*, xxxv. 649–694; and ed. by the Bonn society for philology, Leipsic, 1895; the dissertation of A. Nuth, *De Marci diaconi vita Porphyrii*, Bonn, 1897, is important; cf. Dräseke, in *ZWT*, xxxi (1888), 352–374. Consult further: Tillemont, *Mémoires*, x. 703–716; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, vi. 329–330; *DNB*, iv. 444–445.

PORPHYRY THE NEOPLATONIST. See NEOPLATONISM, III., § 1.

PORST, JOHANN: German Pietist and hymnologist; b. at Oberkotzau (28 m. n.e. of Bayreuth), Dec. 11, 1668; d. at Berlin Jan. 10, 1728. After completing his education at the University of Leipsic, he became private tutor at Neustadt-on-the-Aisch in 1692. Becoming deeply interested in the writings of Spener (q.v.), three years later he removed to Berlin, where he attended the lectures of the distinguished Pietist. In 1698 he was called to be pastor of Malchow and Hohen-Schönhausen near Berlin, and six years later he became second preacher at the Friederich-Werdersche und Dorotheenstädtische Kirche, in both positions remaining true to the principles of Spener, and being a forerunner of certain later tendencies of the Innere Mission. In 1709 he became the chaplain of Sophie Louise, the second wife of Frederick I., and the king invited him in 1713 to become provost of Berlin. After some hesitation, Porst accepted, and became at the same time senior of the Berlin clergy and inspector of the Gray Friars Gymnasium.

Porst's independent literary work was inferior in value to his practical activity as preacher and pastor. Although twenty-four books of his have been enumerated, many of these were only sermons, and others excerpts from larger works written by himself. He devoted much energy to the collecting and editing of edicts and enactments in the interests of church government. At the same time, he wrote several larger works, especially the *Theologia practica regenitorum* (Halle, 1743), and *Theologia viatorum practica* (1755), both ascetic treatises conspicuously Pietistic in tendency. Porst is best known, however, for the hymnal, prepared originally for Berlin but later used throughout Brandenburg, which is one of the chief repositories of hymns breathing the Pietism of Spener and the earlier Halle school. The hymnal first appeared anonymously with the title *Geistliche liebliche Lieder* (Berlin, 1708), containing 420 hymns. A second edition, with 840 hymns, including a special rubric " on the hope of Zion," pertaining to hymns of Chiliastic import, was issued as the *Nun vermehrtes geistreiches Gesangbuch* (1711). The third edition, *Geistliche und liebliche Lieder* (1713), Porst issued in his own name. It contained 906 hymns. The latest revision was that of J. F. Bachmann, of the edition of 1728 (1855; last edition, 1901) from which sixty-two hymns of a false subjectivity were dropped, and an appendix containing 210 earlier or later good hymns was affixed.

(E. IDELER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A sketch of the life of Porst was furnished by Staudt to his ed. of one of Porst's smaller works, *Göttliche Führung der Seelen*, Stuttgart, 1850. Consult further: J. F. Bachmann, *Zur Geschichte der Berliner Gesangbücher*, Berlin, 1856; idem, *Die Gesangbücher Berlins*, ib. 1857; E. E. Koch, *Geschichte des Kirchenlieds*, vol. iv., Stuttgart, 1868.

PORT-ROYAL: One of the most famous of French nunneries, noted for the influence which it exercised in the seventeenth century on the Roman Catholic Church and society of France during the struggle against the Jesuits. It was founded for the Cistercian order in 1204 by Mathilde de Garlande in a swampy unhealthy valley of the Yvette about eight miles southwest of Versailles. Through the favor of the popes it was made exempt from the jurisdiction of the arch-

Foundation: Angélique.

bishop of Paris, and in 1223 Honorius III. gave it the privilege of the Eucharist even if the whole country might be under the interdict, and the privilege of asylum for such of the laity as might wish, without taking the vows, to retire from the world and practise penance. Though the nunnery early became popular and wealthy, while its abbesses included members of the most distinguished families of France, it did not become important in the history of the Church until Jacqueline Marie Arnauld was made its abbess. She was the daughter of Antoine Arnauld (adopted name, Angélique de Ste. Madeleine) and from a distinguished family bitterly opposed to the Jesuits (see ARNAULD). Becoming abbess in 1602 at the age of eleven, she proceeded with a rigorous reformation and set on foot a movement of far-reaching effect on the Roman Catholic Church of France. At Port-Royal fasting, mortification of the flesh, rigid seclusion, and renunciation of all property were required; and the practical works of love, such as the care of the sick, as well as exercises of self-sanctification and devotions, were cultivated with equal fervor. She succeeded in winning her distinguished family to her position, nineteen members of which entered Port-Royal. In 1618 Angélique went, at the request of the abbot of Clairvaux, to Montbuisson to reform the decayed nunnery there. Five years later she returned to Port-Royal accompanied by thirty nuns. On account of the unhealthful situation Angélique in 1625 purchased the building which is now the Hospice de la maternité near the Luxembourg, Paris, calling it Port-Royal de Paris to which she transplanted the nunnery. In 1627 the joint nunnery passed from the jurisdiction of the abbot of Citeaux to that of the archbishop of Paris, and the abbesses were now chosen only for periods of three years. In 1630 Angélique resigned, thus meeting the wishes of Sebastian Zamet, bishop of Langres, who (1626–33) was the spiritual director of Port Royal, giving to it an entirely different trend by substituting magnificence for simplicity.

St. Cyran and The Male Community.

In 1633 Zamet opened a nunnery near the Louvre for the perpetual adoration of the blessed sacrament, of which the archbishop of Paris made Angélique mother superior. Shortly afterward Jean du Vergier de Hauranne became chaplain and confessor; he had been abbot of St. Cyran since 1620, and was accordingly known as St. Cyran (see DU VERGIER, JEAN). A close friend of Jansen since his student days, an equally uncompromising foe of the Jesuits and admirably adapted to be a confessor, he was a man of commanding personal influence. In 1633 a small book of Agnes, the sister of Angélique, the *Chapelet secret du St. Sacrement*, discussing eighteen virtues of Christ, was condemned by the Sorbonne. Zamet, however, approved it, as did Saint Cyran and Jansen. In gratitude for his aid, Zamet introduced St. Cyran into the nunnery of the Blessed Sacrament, whose inmates had been much offended by the book; and through his influence the secularizing tendencies of Zamet vanished more and more until, May 16, 1638, this nunnery was abandoned and its property and privileges were transferred to Port-Royal. In 1636 Angélique returned to Port-Royal, where her sister Agnes was chosen abbess. St. Cyran became here, too, the spiritual guide. Under his influence not only was there a marked renewal of the deepest Roman Catholic piety in the nunnery of Port-Royal, but a community of male ascetics was formed, among whom were the three brothers, Antoine Lemaistre, Louis Isaac Lemaistre de Sacy (q.v.), and Simon de Séricourt, and also Robert Arnauld d'Audilly (see ARNAULD). The last was the eldest brother and the three brothers were nephews of Angélique. The community numbered only twelve in 1646, when it was at its height. These new anchorites, who did not sever themselves utterly from the world, alternated between their annual duties and diligent study of the Bible and Church Fathers (especially Augustine) together with meditations and conversations on religious themes. Great attention was devoted to the education of the young; and in 1646 regular schools were opened in Paris, and in 1653 in the country. The entire number of pupils can not have been more than 1,000. In 1660, however, the schools were suppressed, and from 1670 to 1678 only young girls could be educated. The method was characterized by individual training with moral and religious emphasis, leading to the happiest results. The aim was to awaken and promote the minor powers and to conquer evil propensities. The discipline was marked by vigilance, untiring patience, gentleness, and prayer. The divine image and the human fallibility of the pupil were to be constantly kept in view. Racine was the most distinguished pupil and the "Petites Écoles" made a famous contribution to pedagogical history.

Conflict.

The prominence of Port-Royal could not fail to expose it to opposition. A book on virginity, which exhibited independence of thought, caused Richelieu to imprison St. Cyran on May 14, 1638, in the tower of Vincennes; where, directing his followers uninterruptedly in his correspondence, he remained until his release on Feb. 6, 1643, two months after Richelieu's death. His great achievement during this period was his conversion of Angélique's youngest brother, Antoine Arnauld (1612–94; q.v.), the greatest theologian of Port-Royal. In 1643 Arnauld's *De la frequente communion* (Paris, 1643), with its protest against careless communing, its insistence on repentance, and its warning against the *opus operatum*, was a practical application of Jansenistic principles and the manifesto with which Port-Royal openly declared war on the Jesuits. Arnauld was cited to appear at Rome, but he did not go, remaining for several years in concealment. The period of 1648–56 was that of the greatest prosperity for Port-Royal. During the warfare of the Fronde, the monastery was on the royal side; but when, in his bull of May 31, 1653, Innocent X. condemned five theses of Jansen (see JANSEN, CORNELIUS, JANSENISM) the war on Port-Royal as the French citadel of Jansenism broke out. Arnauld, expelled from the Sorbonne, Sacy, Fontaine, and Nicole sought hiding in Paris. The community obeyed the command to retire from Port-Royal, but the threatened blow was averted by Pascal's

defense of Jansenism in his *Lettres provinciales* (see PASCAL, BLAISE) and by the miracle of the holy thorn, four days after the retirement, which was the alleged cure of an ulcer in the eye of Marguerite Perier, Pascal's niece, effected by touching the holy thorn, and which was exalted by Port-Royalists as a confirmation of their faith and by the wonder-struck Jesuits as a new divine respite for the Jansenists. The following years formed a period of peace; but upon his accession in 1660, Louis XIV determined to annihilate both Jansenism and Protestantism in France, and in April of the following year both monasteries were compelled to dismiss their pensioners, postulants, and novices. Antoine Singlin, superior of the nuns, barely escaped the Bastile and again sought hiding with Arnauld in Paris. On June 8, 1661, the first pastoral letter that by equivocations was to make subscription possible appeared; which, not without severe inner struggles, the nuns signed. On Aug. 6 Angélique died at Paris. Port-Royal was obliged to accept the Molinist Louis Bail as superior, and neither Arnauld, Pascal, nor Singlin dared to return. Bail's rigid examination of the nuns one after another in both convents from July 11 to Sept. 2, 1661, resulted in finding no support for the allegations against them. Nevertheless, on Nov. 28, 1661, they were forced to sign the formula unreservedly. The controversies of Louis XIV. with the Curia now gave a brief respite to Port-Royal, but an attempt to reach a peaceable understanding was thwarted by the stubbornness of Arnauld. With the enthronement of H. de Péréfixe as archbishop of Paris in 1664, the persecutions were reopened, and on Aug. 21 he denied the nuns the reception of the Eucharist. Twelve of the nuns were then scattered in other nunneries and nuns were brought from these convents to Port-Royal in Paris. On Nov. 29 more nuns were removed; and a few days after the archbishop excommunicated the entire monastery of Port-Royal des Champs. Sacraments were denied; no novices could be received; the sound of bells and common worship ceased; and there was forced seclusion from outside friends, until, early in 1669, Pope Clement IX., by permitting an apparent ambiguity in the subscription, enabled most of the Jansenist party, including Arnauld, De Sacy, and Pierre Nicole (q.v.), to sign the formula. The nuns were finally persuaded to sign a petition of surrender repudiating the five theses, to the archbishop of Paris, and, Mar. 3, 1669, the interdict was formally raised. Thus ended the long controversy in the humiliation of Port-Royal, and its financial ruin soon followed. Port-Royal de Paris and Port-Royal des Champs were separated, the former securing two-thirds of the properties.

Until 1679 Port-Royal enjoyed tolerable peace, and the polemics of the leaders of the party were now directed against Protestantism. Arnauld and Nicole published their *La Perpetuité de la foi de l'église catholique touchant l'Eucharistie* (Paris, 1669), and Arnauld also thoroughly approved the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. During this period of peace the nunnery again increased in numbers; the hermits returned; Pascal wrote his *Pensées*, and Nicole his *Essais de Morale* (25 vols., Paris, 1741, 1755). When, however, in 1677 Nicole implored Innocent XI. to condemn the lax teachings of the casuists, the king regarded his act as a violation of the truce; and in the bitter controversy over the regalia he was offended that the Jansenists sided with the pope. Arnauld and Nicole were forced again to flee from France, and on June 17, 1679, Archbishop Harlay brought the royal mandate to dismiss the pupils and the hermits and to admit no more nuns until the number had fallen to fifty. When this took place, the privilege was, however, denied; the monastery began to die out; and in 1706 the last abbess of Port-Royal des Champs, Elisabeth de Ste. Anne Boulard, died. The bull *Vineam Domini* of Clement XI. (July 15, 1705), with its summary condemnation of Jansenism, hastened the catastrophe. The nuns signed it only with a reservation. They were forbidden to receive novices or to elect a new abbess. On Nov. 22, 1707, the convent was again excommunicated, and the king secured the issuance of a papal bull on Mar. 27, 1708, which permitted the dispersion of the nuns. On July 11 of the following year a decree of the archbishop of Paris declared the convent of Port-Royal des Champs suppressed and gave its estates to Port-Royal de Paris. On Oct. 29 the remaining twenty-two nuns, ranging in age from fifty to upward of eighty, were expelled by military force; and, being thus dispersed, all subscribed to the bull except two. The royal disapproval extended even to the buildings of Port-Royal; and by a mandate of Jan. 22, 1710, the convent and church were destroyed and even the dead were removed and interred in a neighboring cemetery. (EUGEN LACHENMANN.)

Decline.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: C. A. Sainte-Beuve, *Port Royal*, 5 vols., Paris, 1840–59, new ed., 7 vols., 1908 (the best work, though unsympathetic); Fontaine, *Mémoires . . de Port Royal*, 2 vols., Utrecht, 1736; Du Fossé, *Mémoires de Port-Royal*, Utrecht, 1739; P. LeClerc, *Vies intéressantes . . des religieuses de Port Royal*, 4 vols., Utrecht, 1750; idem, *Vies intéressantes . . des amis de Port-Royal*, ib. 1751; J. Besoigne, *Hist. de l'abbaye de Port-Royal*, 6 vols., Cologne, 1754–53; P. Guilbert, *Mémoires historiques . . sur l'abbaye de Port-Royal*, vols. i., iii., Utrecht, 1752–59; H. Grégoire, *Les Ruines de Port-Royal*, Paris, 1809; H. Reuchlin, *Geschichte von Port-Royal*, 2 vols., Hamburg, 1839–44; J. M. Neale, *Hist. of the so-called Jansenist Church of Holland*, Oxford, 1858; Mrs. M. A. Schimmelpenninck, *Select Memoirs of Port Royal*, 5th ed., London, 1858; J. Stephen, *Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography*, pp. 279–336, 4th ed., London, 1860; C. Beard, *Port Royal*, 2 vols., London, 1861; C. Clemencet, *Hist. littéraire de Port-Royal*, vol. i., Paris, 1867; A. Ricard, *Les Premiers Jansénistes et Port-Royal*, Paris, 1883; E. Fenot, *Port-Royal et Magny*, Paris, 1888; L. Séché, *Les Derniers Jansénistes (1710–1820)*, 3 vols., Paris, 1891; R. Allier, *La Cabale des dévots 1627–1666*, pp. 159–192, Paris, 1902; W. R. Clark, *Pascal and the Port-Royalists*, London, 1902; A. Malvault, *Répertoire alphabétique des personnes et choses de Port-Royal*, Paris, 1902; Ethel Romanes, *The Story of Port Royal*, London, 1907; A. Gazier, *Abrégé de l'histoire de Port Royal d'après un manuscrit préparé pour l'impression par Jean-Baptiste Racine*, Paris, 1908; M. E. Lowndes, *The Nuns of Port Royal as seen in their own Narratives*, New York, 1909; the literature under PASCAL, BLAISE.

PORTANOVA, GENNARO: Cardinal; b. at Naples Oct. 11, 1845; d. at Rome Apr. 25, 1908. He was educated at the Jesuit College in his native

city, and at the archiepiscopal lyceum of Naples, where he was professor of theology, 1877–83, besides being professor of philosophy in various Neapolitan institutions 1875–83. In 1883 he was consecrated titular bishop of Rosea and appointed bishop coadjutor of Ischia, to which see he succeeded on the death of his diocesan two years later. In 1888 he was translated to the metropolitan see of Reggio di Calabria, of which he was archbishop till his death. He was likewise apostolic administrator of the diocese of Bova from 1889 to 1895 and of Oppido in 1898–99. In 1899 he was created cardinal-priest of San Clemente in Rome. He wrote *Errori e deliri del Darwinismo* (Naples, 1872); *Su la distinzione della psicologia dalla fisiolofia e su le mutue loro attinenze* (1875); *Gli Evoluzionisti e la loro morale* (Rome, 1881); *Evoluzione e miraculo* (Naples, 1882); and *La Filosofia speculativa compendiata* (1883).

PORTER, EBENEZER: Congregationalist; b. at Cornwall, Conn., Oct. 5, 1772; d. at Andover Apr. 8, 1834. He was graduated at Dartmouth College, 1792; ordained 1796, pastor in Washington, Conn.; Bartlett professor of sacred rhetoric in the Andover Theological Seminary, 1812–32, and president, 1827–34. He was the author of *Young Preacher's Manual* (Boston, 1819); *An Analysis of the Principles of Rhetorical Delivery* (1827; 8th ed., by A. H. Weld, Boston, 1839); *Rhetorical Reader* (Andover, 1831; 300th ed., New York, 1858); *Lectures on Homiletics, Preaching, and on Public Prayer* (Andover, 1834); and *Lectures on Eloquence and Style* (Andover, 1836).

Bibliography: W. B. Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, ii. 351–361, New York, 1859; L. Woods, *Hist. of the Andover Theological Seminary*, ib. 1884.

PORTER, FRANK CHAMBERLAIN: Congregationalist; b. at Beloit, Wis., Jan. 5, 1859. He was educated at Beloit College (A.B., 1880) and the theological seminaries at Chicago (1881–82), Hartford (1884–85), and Yale (B.D., 1886; Ph.D., 1889). He was teacher of mathematics and Greek in the Chicago High School (1882–84), and instructor in Biblical theology in Yale Divinity School (1889–91), while since 1891 he has been Winkley professor of Biblical theology in the same institution. In Biblical study he "advocates a strictly historical method (in contrast to a dogmatic)," while in theological position he is a liberal Evangelical. He has written *The Yeçer Hara: A study in the Jewish Doctrine of Sin*, in the *Biblical and Semitic Studies* of the *Yale Bicentennial Series* (New York, 1903) and *The Messages of the Apocalyptic Writers* (1905).

PORTER, JOSIAS LESLIE: English Presbyterian; b. at Burt, County Donegal, Ireland, Oct. 4, 1823; d. at Belfast Mar. 16, 1889. He graduated at Glasgow (B.A., 1841; M.A., 1842); was ordained, 1846; studied theology at the Free Church College and University, both Edinburgh, 1842–44; pastor at Newcastle-on-Tyne, 1846–49; missionary of the Presbyterian Church of Ireland in Damascus, 1849–59; professor of Biblical criticism in the Presbyterian College, Belfast, Ireland, 1860–77 He was especially prominent by reason of his connection with Irish educational institutions and interests. He was the author of *Five Years in Damascus* (2 vols., London, 1855; 2d ed., 1870); *Hand-book for Syria and Palestine* (2 vols., 1858; 3d ed., 1875); *The Pentateuch and the Gospels* (1864); *The Giant Cities of Bashan, and Holy Places of Syria* (1865); *The Life and Times of Henry Cooke, D.D., LL.D.* (London, 1871); *The Pew and Study Bible* (1876); *Jerusalem, Bethany and Bethlehem* (1887); and *Through Samaria to Galilee and the Jordan* (1888). He edited J. Kitto's *Daily Bible Illustrations* (Edinburgh, 1867) and J. Brown's *Self-Interpreting Bible* (1871).

Bibliography: *DNB*, xlvi. 187–188.

PORTER, NOAH: Congregationalist; b. at Farmington, Conn., Dec. 14, 1811; d. at New Haven, Conn., Mar. 4, 1892. He graduated at Yale College (1831), was master of Hopkins Grammar School, New Haven (1831–33); tutor at Yale (1833–1835); pastor at New Milford, Conn. (1836–43); at Springfield, Mass. (1843–46); Clark professor of metaphysics and moral philosophy at Yale College (1846–71); and president of Yale College (1871–1886). His presidency was a period of great expansion and progress, and his wide fame as a scholar was equalled by his popularity and influence at home. He was the author of *Historical Discourse at Farmington, Nov. 4, 1840*, commemorating the two-hundredth anniversary of its settlement (Hartford, 1841); *The Educational Systems of the Puritans and Jesuits compared* (New York, 1851); *The Human Intellect* (1868, and many others); *Books and Reading* (1870; 6th ed., 1881); *American Colleges and the American Public* (1870); *Elements of Intellectual Science* (1871); *Sciences of Nature versus the Science of Man* (1871); *Evangeline: the Place, the Story, and the Poem* (1882); *The Elements of Moral Science, Theoretical and Practical* (1885); *Bishop Berkeley* (1885); *Kant's Ethics, a Critical Exposition* (Chicago, 1886); and *Fifteen Years in the Chapel of Yale College* (Sermons, 1871–86; New York, 1887). He was the principal editor of the revised editions of Webster's *Unabridged Dictionary* (Springfield, 1864, 1880).

Bibliography: G. S. Merriam, *Noah Porter: a Memorial by Friends*, New York, 1893 (contains bibliography); W. Walker, *Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism*, pp. 559–561, ib. 1893.

PORTEUS, BEILBY: Church of England bishop; b. at York May 8, 1731; d. at Fulham (6 m. s.w. of St. Paul's, London) May 8, 1808. He received his preliminary education at York and at Ripon, and then entered Christ's College, Cambridge (B.A. and fellow, 1752; D.D., 1767); he was made deacon and priest, 1757, and in 1759 won the Seatonian prize for a poem on death; he became domestic chaplain to the archbishop of Canterbury (Thomas Secker, q.v.) in 1762, from whom in 1765 he received the livings of Rucking and Wittersham, Kent, soon after exchanging them for Hunton, of which he became rector; he received a prebend in Peterborough, 1767, in 1769 became chaplain to the king, and in 1776 bishop of Chester, being translated in 1787 to the see of London. As preacher he was noted for marked ability and directness; as bishop his excellencies were many. He encouraged

the rising evangelicalism of the times, took great interest in fostering the comfort of the poorer clergy of his dioceses by securing funds for the increase of their emoluments and also by procuring the abolishment of the evil practise of making them sign bonds to resign when requested; he was deeply interested in the question of slavery and the welfare of negroes; he promoted the cause of the British and Foreign Bible Society, acting as its vice-president; and was efficient in preventing the abuse of religious holidays. He opposed the spread of the principles of the French Revolution and equally the doctrines of Paine's *Age of Reason*. He was himself possessed of ample means, and these he used generously in support of various of the interests noted above.

He was the author of many occasional sermons, as well as of volumes of sermons, e.g., *Sermons on Several Subjects* (London, 1784; 14th ed., 1813); also of *Review of the Life and Character of Archbishop Secker* (1770; twelve editions); *The Beneficial Effects of Christianity on the Temporal Concerns of Mankind Proved from History and Facts* (1804; 9th ed., 1836); *Summary of the Principal Evidences for the Truth and Divine Origin of the Christian Revelation* (1800; 15th ed., 1835); and *Lectures on the Gospel of St. Matthew* (2 vols., 1802; 17th ed., 1823). His *Complete Works* were often published (best ed., 6 vols., 1816; really not " complete ").

Bibliography: His *Life*, by R. Hodgson, is prefixed to vol. i. of his *Works*. Consult: C. J. Abbey, *The English Church and its Bishops*, 2 vols., London, 1887; J. H. Overton, *English Church in the 19th Century*, ib. 1894; J. H. Overton and F. Relton, *The English Church (1714–1800)*, ib. 1906; *DNB*, xlvi. 195–196.

PORTIUNCULA INDULGENCE: The title of a plenary indulgence granted to all who should devoutly visit the Portiuncula Church (St Mary of the Angels; see Francis, Saint, of Assisi, I., § 1), near Assisi, at the request of Saint Francis of Assisi by Honorius III. in 1223. This pope confined it to Aug. 2; Gregory XV. in 1622 made it good for all churches of the Observantist Franciscans on that day; Innocent XI. in 1678 made its benefits applicable to souls in purgatory. In 1847 the Congregation of Indulgences made it applicable to every Franciscan church.

PORTO RICO. See West Indies.

PORTUGAL.

I. History and Statistics.
II. Evangelical Work.
The Conditions (§ 1).
Anti-Roman Tendencies (§ 2).
Evangelical Activities (§ 3).
Agencies Employed (§ 4).
Results and Prospects (§ 5).

I. History and Statistics: Since October, 1910, Portugal has been a republic. It is situated in southwestern Europe, between Spain on the north and east and the Atlantic Ocean on the south and west; area, including the Azores and Madeira, 35,491 square miles; population, 5,423,132. The present boundaries were established in 1255. At that time began the struggles between the royal sovereignty and the clergy, owing to the clergy's opposition to royal taxation, or following measures against particular bishops. The Jesuits very early gained influence at court, became a ruling force in the educational establishments of the country, and through them the Inquisition (q.v.) was introduced. This development prevailed so that, in the first half of the eighteenth century, the aggregate of the clergy and nuns amounted to ten per cent of the population. Under John V. (1706–50), with very great pomp, the archdiocese of Lisbon was exalted to the rank of a patriarchate, and the king of Portugal obtained the title of *rex fidelissimus*. The property of the Church increased more and more through the donations of real estate, so that from the twelfth century the cathedral churches have received one-third of the parish church tithe. King Joseph Manuel (1750–77), however, indorsed his minister Pombal's demand for the expulsion of the Jesuits, 1759, and the secularization of a great part of the church estates. The clergy grew very powerful again under the next king and continued so by virtue of the repeal of the constitution of 1821. But a strong reaction set in again in the period 1834–1836. The Jesuits, who had been recalled, were again expelled; the tribunal of the papal nuncio was abolished; not a few bishops and cloister clergy were dismissed from their positions, and the assignment of parishes was defined to be a function of the civil government. All the monasteries for men and their educational establishments were declared abolished. This, however, was not practically enforced, and a concordat in the year 1842, failing only in receiving the final state acknowledgment, gave evidence of a new reaction. It obtained a lease of existence both by the extension of orders and congregations and by the multiplication of fraternal organizations. These brotherhoods are supported largely by gifts; because they serve to establish orphanages and the like. In 1862, indeed, most of the church estates were sold; but the proceeds were turned over to the clergy, and a considerable yearly provision for the entire spiritual body (700,000 milreis; $752,500), on the part of the State, was fixed by statute. Though, in 1878, the civil class-list was introduced on account of the marriage of non-Roman Catholics, yet every other innovation undesired by the clergy was omitted. The hierarchy consists of the three ecclesiastical provinces of Lisbon, Braga, and Evora, under which, on the mainland, there are nine bishoprics covering twelve diocesan districts and upward of 3,800 parishes. The constitution of 1821, which long since recovered its validity, declares the Roman Catholic to be the only authorized church. No building of worship may be erected by those of another faith. [On the proclamation of the republic action was taken looking to the elimination of the religious orders.]

Education is retarded; only about one-fifth of the population can write. Of the forty-one colleges, eighteen belong to the clergy. There are German Evangelical congregations at Oporto, Lisbon, and on Fayal Island. Congregations of the Church of England and of the Free Church of Scotland are at Corunna, Oporto, Lisbon, and Porta-Legre.

Wilhelm Goetz.

II. Evangelical Work: Of all European countries Portugal is the only one that was never touched by the Reformation. At the beginning of the six-

teenth century Portugal was enjoying the most brilliant period of her whole history, and by reason of her maritime and colonial enterprises was rapidly advancing to the front ranks of European powers. Nevertheless, in the sphere of religion, she seems to have escaped the stimulus which came to all other European countries, during this or the following centuries, from the Protestant Reformation. Several reasons may be offered in explanation: (1) The relative isolation of Portugal and her remoteness from the centers of the religious movement, together with the lack of easy means of communication in that period, precluded the possibility of the Portuguese coming in contact with the followers or the literature of the Reformers. (2) The absence of that preliminary preparation which came to other countries through the preaching of such early Reformers as Wyclif in England, Huss in Bohemia, Savonarola in Italy, and Lefevre in France, had left untilled the seed-plot in which the seeds of the Reformation might have taken root. (3) The most important factor, perhaps, in closing Portugal against the influences of the Reformation was the political despotism, united with that of the Church, which prevailed in Portugal at that time. This union was further strengthened in 1536 by the formal establishment of the Inquisition, and still more firmly cemented in 1540 by the admission of the Jesuits, into whose hands were committed the destinies of the nation for the two centuries that followed. Whatever the reasons may be, it is to be remarked that Portugal has continued down to modern times the most exclusively, if not the most intensely, Roman Catholic of all the Latin nations; and until to-day there has been no serious effort at religious reform.

1. The Conditions.

Through all the stormy history of the little kingdom, Roman Catholicism has remained the State religion, and but few crises have arisen in which the voice of the Roman Catholic Church has not determined the policy of the nation. The only considerable defection from that church so far may be traced either to educational or political movements, rather than to the desire for religious reform. Toward the close of the eighteenth century the gradual infiltration of the ideas of the French philosophers inaugurated a "liberal" tendency among the cultured classes, which has steadily grown until to-day about fifty per cent of the educated Portuguese, if not professedly infidel, are in open opposition to the clergy. This movement away from the Church has been limited somewhat by the dense ignorance of the great mass of the people and the scant attention paid to education. In 1878 the illiterates were 82 per cent of the population and in 1909 they still comprised 78.6 per cent. In 1900 there were only 240,000 pupils in the elementary schools of Portugal, though education has been declared compulsory since 1844. Likewise in the political affairs of Portugal the nineteenth century marked a persistent struggle by certain elements of the population for "liberal" principles. The pernicious interference by the Roman Catholic clergy to defeat the aims of this movement attracted a constantly increasing hatred from the working classes and has developed a strong anti-clerical party among the masses themselves. Indeed, the overthrow of the monarchy in October, 1910, with the flight of young King Manuel, seems to indicate that liberal principles have now won to their support the majority of the people. And Senor Sebastiano Magalhaes Lima, one of the leaders in the new republic, has announced that "the program of reform will include the separation of Church and State." On the other hand, the most recent statistics indicate that the secular clergy in Portugal numbers 93,979 parish priests in a total population of 5,423,132, an average of one priest to every fifty-seven inhabitants.

2. Anti-Roman Tendencies.

The foregoing facts would lead to the anticipation that the history of Evangelical Protestantism in Portugal does not begin until the nineteenth century, and that it owes its origin not to any stimulus received from the Reformation of the sixteenth century, but to the missionary activity of Protestant denominations during the last century. As far as can be learned, it was not before 1845 that the Gospel was for the first time persistently proclaimed in Portugal. Meetings were commenced almost simultaneously in Lisbon and in Oporto. In Lisbon it was Mrs. Helen Roughton, wife of an English merchant, who first, with her husband's assistance, held private meetings in her house and established a school for Protestant instruction. The Roughtons belonged to the Church of England, and their humble efforts resulted in the establishment of the Anglican Church of the Taipas, Lisbon. Mrs. Roughton lived until 1885, but a few years before her death adopted the views of the Plymouth Brethren (q.v.). At Oporto the first Evangelical worker was Miss Frederica Smith, who began work privately in 1845. She was born of English parents in Oporto and was subsequently married to James Cooley Fletcher, United States consul at Oporto. At Oporto there labored also about this time, Rev. A. de Mattos, one of the converts of a mission in Madeira, a naturalized American and probably the first Portuguese Protestant to preach in Portugal. Since these early beginnings several British societies have opened stations at Lisbon and Oporto, as well as at several other of the principal cities of Portugal. The Plymouth Brethren have considerable strength, especially in Lisbon. The Scotch Presbyterians also have a mission there. The Wesleyan Methodists have an important work in Oporto, under charge of Robert H. Moreton, who has spent thirty-seven years at this post. The strongest Evangelical church in Portugal is the Anglican. It has several stations in both Lisbon and Oporto. Besides this there are independent Protestant churches at Oporto and Porta-Legre, supporting their own pastors, while all over Portugal there are little bands of believers, without organization or a pastor, which are centers of influence thoroughly Protestant in spirit.

3. Evangelical Activities.

It has been remarked that the first Evangelical work in Portugal was done in connection with the school. It is hardly necessary to state that this method has been largely adhered to by the foreign

societies. In connection with almost every station, schools have been organized as the basis of operation, there being at least a dozen Prot-

4. Agencies Employed.

estant schools in the two cities Lisbon and Oporto. Scarcely less important than the work of the missions and schools has been that of the great Bible and Tract societies. Says a writer from the field: "Representatives of the union of Protestantism, the British and Foreign Bible Society, and the Religious Tract Society have done and are doing the widest and deepest, though the least apparent, Gospel work. Their general agent, Rev. Robert Stewart, with headquarters in Lisbon, keeps constantly employed six or eight colporteurs, canvassing the different provinces in Portugal and distributing Scriptures, tracts, and Christian literature." Of the Portuguese versions of the Scriptures, only two have become generally known: a Roman Catholic version by Antonio Pereira de Figueiredo in twenty-three volumes (1778; see BIBLE VERSIONS, B, XIV.; reedited in seven volumes and greatly improved in 1804), and a Protestant version by Joaõ Ferreira d'Almeida (1693, for use in the Portuguese colonies; revised and republished in Lisbon in 1874, and again in 1877). Besides, the American Bible Society published a version of the New Testament in 1859, and more recently the committee representing the Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Baptist, and Wesleyan churches, has prepared, under the superintendence of Rev. Robert Stewart, a complete new version of the Bible. In connection with the mission and Bible agencies there have been established at Lisbon and Oporto several Protestant papers, which have a relatively wide circulation and have proved valuable adjuncts in spreading the word of truth.

The latest official census of Portugal credits the Protestants with something less than 500 members, including foreigners. But this is obviously inaccurate; no complete statistics are available from the several societies, but conservative estimates place the number of communicants at over 1,000, with possibly 3,000 adherents.

It will be seen that the record of evangelistic work in Portugal is brief, uneventful, and to the unsympathetic student uninspiring; in-

5. Results and Prospects.

deed, measured in terms of adherents won, churches built, and schools or colleges opened, it must be admitted that the results have hardly justified the expenditure of money and toil and the sacrifice of life at which they have been secured. Nevertheless, to the intelligent student of missions, who has an adequate grasp of conditions in Portugal, the Protestant propaganda conducted there does not appear so fruitless, nor the outlook so hopeless as the bare statistics seem to indicate. So far, the work in Portugal has been preparatory merely, and it has encountered those obstacles which are incident to pioneer efforts at evangelism in all Roman Catholic countries, namely, the ignorance, irreligion, and intolerance of the people. It may be that in Portugal these conditions have been more acute than in other Latin countries. The large percentage of illiteracy has already been noted, and when it is considered that the uneducated classes are the only portion of the population that are accessible, ordinarily, to evangelistic effort, it will be seen that the growth of Protestantism must depend almost entirely upon the educational facilities which the missions can offer. In particular the ignorance of the Portuguese concerning Protestantism is amazing. Both the peasant and the educated, the layman and ecclesiastic are wholly ignorant of its nature. The peasant and the layman confound Protestants with Jews, Moors, and unbelievers, and, taught by their priests, they have associated with Protestantism everything that is despicable and immoral. As for skepticism, it is not confined to the educated but, as in other nominally Roman Catholic countries, practical infidelity prevails to a distressing extent among the priests and people, and gives rise to the most appalling vices and immoralities in all walks of life. The Portuguese people know nothing of tolerance as Protestants understand it. A clause providing for religious tolerance has long been in the national constitution, but it has no reference to Protestantism. To the people the only representative of Christianity is the Roman Catholic Church, and tolerance means nothing more than the right to oppose the Roman Catholic clergy. It has not infrequently happened that the people incited by the Jesuits and priests have indulged in violent persecutions of Protestants. In addition to all this the missionary activities of Protestants have been projected in a haphazard fashion and on a scale wholly inadequate to the measure of the need. Despite these untoward circumstances enough has already been accomplished to constitute a solid and necessary foundation for the great work that yet remains to be done. Moreover, when account is taken of what has already been done in the face of such obstacles, and of its significance in the light of the new era that is even now dawning for Portugal, there is room for the assertion that Protestantism has a great mission to this priest-ridden people. The missionaries are on the ground. They have occupied the strategic points of vantage. They have entrenched themselves in various directions, reaching out from these centers. They have established a few schools and churches and gathered at many points the nuclei of Protestant communities. They have sown the seed of truth broadcast by the printed and preached Word, and are now ready for the harvest. Meanwhile recent years have brought about a vast change in the attitude of the people toward education and the progressive ideas that have brought prosperity to other nations. There is a noticeable and increasing respect for literary attainments, and recent writers display literary ability of no mean value. There is a general desire among all classes of people to give their children the benefits of education. There is a wide-spread clamor for industrial and commercial reform; and the almost peaceful establishment of the new republic with its liberal program of reform demonstrates the unanimity with which the people are awaking to the need of radical change in national policies. Along with this there comes from the bosom of the Church itself, in a communication from the Franciscan monks to the hierarchy, an

urgent demand for religious reform. In other words, Portugal is approaching her renaissance, political revolution, and Reformation all at once, and there is no reason why the Reformation should not be cast in the mold which Protestant evangelism has provided. JUAN ORTS GONZALEZ.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: H. Schäfer, *Geschichte von Portugal*, 5 vols., Hamburg, 1836–54; E. MacMurdo, *Hist. of Portugal*, 2 vols., London, 1888–89; H. M. Stephens, *Portugal*, ib. 1891; W. A. Salisbury, *Portugal and its People*, ib. 1893; H. E. Noyes, *Church Reform in Portugal*, ib. 1897; L. Higgin, *Portuguese Life in Town and Country*, ib. 1902; H. C. Lea, *Hist. of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages*, new ed., 3 vols., New York, 1906; idem, *Hist. of the Inquisition of Spain*, new ed., 4 vols., ib. 1906–07; F. E. and H. A. Clark, *The Gospel in Latin Lands*, ib. 1909; J. McCabe, *The Decay of the Church of Rome*, ib. 1909.

POSITIVISM: The name applied to the teachings of Auguste Comte (q.v.), which, since the middle of the nineteenth century, have been accepted in the stricter sense by what is practically a sect, and more loosely by a large school of admirers of his 'Positive Philosophy." The latter, by far the more numerous, have usually regarded his later political teaching, if not as the product of distinct mental aberration, at best as a sentimental illusion, or as analogous to Plato's "Republic" and "Laws," to be admired theoretically but incapable of practical realization. The system taught by Comte in his first great book was essentially atheistic and anti-theological; the only sciences there considered as the main branches of human knowledge were mathematics, mechanics (including astronomy), physics, chemistry, physiology, and sociology. Even psychology, the connecting link between physiology and sociology, was omitted—a defect which the English adherents of Comte, under John Stuart Mill's leadership, felt obliged to supply. This fundamentally non-religious attitude was based in one aspect on the English and French sensualist philosophy of the eighteenth century, especially on Étienne de Condillac, Thomas Reid, and Dugald Stewart; in its socialistic speculation it was largely dependent on Marie Jean Caritat de Condorcet, and in the leading ideas of its philosophy of history on the Italians Giovanni Battista Vico and Tommaso Campanella. In fact, what has frequently been regarded as Comte's principal achievement—the definition of the law of human progress through the three stages of theology, metaphysics, and positivism, or pure empiricism in the exact sciences—is really found in both the last-named, as well as in the French physiocrat Anne Robert Jacques Turgot. In like manner his doctrine of the transition of the process leading to social perfection from belligerent conquest to defense by force, and from that again to peaceful labor, is nothing more than a simple development of what Condorcet had taught in 1793; and his theory of Fetishism (q.v.) as the primal form of religion goes back in its essence to Charles de Brosses (1760).

In spite, however, of this lack of originality, and in spite of the transformation which the system has received at the hands of John Stuart Mill, Herbert Spencer, John Fiske, and others, the "hierarchy of the sciences" and Comte's general line of thought have maintained a considerable degree of popularity among English-speaking and French philosophers. Among the latter it influenced especially Émile Littré, Hippolyte Taine, Ernest Renan, and Théodule Ribot, while Henry Thomas Buckle, George Henry Lewes, Leslie Stephen, John Tyndall, and Thomas Henry Huxley took their stand on the same "positive" ground, and the modern Scottish sensualism of such thinkers as Alexander Bain shows no slight traces of its influence. In America John William Draper followed practically the same path as Comte in his *History of the Conflict between Religion and Science* (New York, 1874), and more recently Paul Carus (q.v.), editor of *The Monist* and author of several works of like tendency, has conducted a propaganda which has much in common with Comte's. Italy has its thinkers of the same school in Tito Vignoli, Roberto Ardigò, Pietro Siciliani, and Andrea Angiulli, and not a few chairs of philosophy in Spain and Portugal are occupied by adherents of Comte. Among German positivists in the narrower sense may be named Ernst Laas, Adolf Steudel, Friedrich Jodl, Alois Riehl, and Georg von Gizycki; and as less thorough-going adherents of Comte mention may be made of such philosophers as Wilhelm Wundt, Theobald Ziegler, and Julius Baumann.

There has been, however, much misconception in the attempt to connect certain modern non-religious systems directly with Comte. The evolutionism of Darwin and Spencer has really little in common with his doctrine; he vigorously combated Darwin's forerunner, Jean Baptiste Pierre Antoine de Monet Lamarck; and Huxley and other leaders of the evolutionist school have in their turn sharply criticized him. His attitude toward religion, nevertheless, has had not a little to do with that of some of the leading opponents of religious systems in more recent times. It is now clear that Karl Marx took some of his most important and characteristic doctrines from Comte's sociology; and Friedrich Nietzsche (q.v.), after a period of almost exclusive devotion to Arthur Schopenhauer's pessimism, adopted several points of Comte's teaching.

The Positivist sect, based upon Comte's *Système de politique positive*, possesses popular manuals of teaching and practise in the *Calendrier positiviste* (Paris, 1849) and *Catéchisme positiviste* (1853). It teaches "the transformation of philosophy into religion"; but the philosophy thus transformed is the positivist philosophy, with no belief in God, the soul, or immortality. The cult of humanity on which it rests is a fantastic veneration of heroes, men of genius, scientists, and women. The calendar contains nine sacraments and eighty-four recurrent festivals. The thirteen months, of twenty-eight days each, take their designations from notable benefactors of the human race. Moses, Homer, Aristotle, Archimedes, Cæsar, Paul, Charlemagne, Dante, Gutenberg, Shakespeare, Descartes, Frederick II., and Bichat (a famous Parisian physician and anatomist, d. 1802). Each of the days of the week is dedicated to a minor hero, as Sophocles, Horace, Copernicus, Galileo, and Cuvier. For the administration of the sacraments and the general direction of the body a sort of hierarchy is postulated. The sect in England was for a long time

under the direction of Frederic Harrison and Richard Congreve, and in France principally under that of Pierre Laffitte in Paris. When the latter died in 1903, it was felt by many that "orthodox" Positivism was near its end; but although the section of Comte's followers which still preserves a certain type of religious feeling is yet in existence, it can not be said that they adhere closely to his prescriptions. Their formulas vary, in fact, between a weakly naturalistic deism and a radical atheism. The group of positivists which grew up around Francis Ellingwood Abbot in America about 1870 called themselves the professors of a "Free Religion," and their views, as expressed in Abbot's "Fifty Affirmations," were in many ways much more radical than Comte's. Of a similar nature are some manifestations of free thought in France and Belgium, as they appear in Eugène Sémérie's periodical *La Politique positive* (Paris and Versailles), in Jean François Eugène Robinet's *Le Radical*, and in Edgar Monteil's *Catéchisme du libre-penseur* (Antwerp, 1877), in which atheism is partially concealed by a few phrases which have a theistic ring, and a corresponding scheme of morality is taught which is in its essence mere Epicureanism. The German free-thinking sects founded by Eduard Löwenthal and Eduard Reich are really German products, with no closely demonstrable connection with Comte, though some things about them (such as the title of the latter, the Church of Humanity) are reminiscent of his teaching. For an English analogy to Comte's Positivism under the leadership of George Jacob Holyoake, Charles Bradlaugh, etc., see SECULARISM. (O. ZÖCKLER†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Besides the literature in and under the article on Comte (q.v.), where the sources are given *in extenso*, consult: C. de Blignières, *Exposition abrégée de la philosophie et de la religion positive*, Paris, 1857; idem, *Le Doctrine Positive*, ib. 1867; idem, *Études de moral positive*, ib. 1868; L. Pinel, *Essai de philosophie positive*, 2d ed., ib. 1857; C. Pellarin, *Essai critique sur la philosophie positive*, ib. 1864; J. H. Bridges, *Unity of Compte's Life and Doctrine*, London, 1866; F. B. Barton, *An Outline of the Positive Religion*, ib. 1867; J. Ladevi-Roche, *Le Positivisme au tribunal de la science*, Paris, 1867; J. Douboul, *Le Positivisme: sa méthode ses antécédentes et ses conséquences*, Paris, 1867; L. André-Nuytz, *Le Positivisme pour tous*, Paris, 1868; A. Angiulli, *La Filosofia e la Ricerca positiva*, Naples, 1868; R. Ardigò, *Opere filosofiche*, 7 vols., Padua, 1869–94; A. d'Assier, *Essai de philosophie positive au xix. siècle*, Paris, 1870; T. H. Huxley, *Lay Sermons*, London, 1870; P. Alex, *Du droit et du positivisme*, Paris, 1876; L. Adrian, *Essais sur quelques points de philosophie positive*, ib. 1877; M. Châteauneuf, *Le Positivisme et la materialisme devant la loi du progrès*, ib. 1877; É. Littré, *Aug. Comte et la philosophie positive*, 3d ed., ib. 1877; G. Barzellotti, *La Morale delle Filosofie positive*, New York, 1878; R. Flint, *Anti-Theistic Theories*, Edinburgh, 1879; idem, *Philosophy of History*, ib. 1874; idem, *Agnosticism*, ib. 1903; L. Liard, *La Science positive et la metaphysique*, Paris, 1879; E. Laas, *Idealismus und Positivismus*, 3 vols., Berlin, 1879–1884; E. H. Beesly, *Comte as a Moral Type*, London, 1880; J. H. Bridges, *Comte's General View of Positivism*, ib. 1880; J. Kaines, *Seven Lectures on the Doctrine of Positivism*, ib. 1880; J. F. E. Robinet, *Le Positivisme*, Paris, 1881; P. de Broglie, *Le Positivisme et la science experimentale*, 2 vols., ib. 1882; G. Allievo, *Del Positivismo*, Turin, 1883; J. H. Bridges, *Comte, the Successor of Aristotle*, London, 1883; E. Caro, *Littré et la positivisme*, Paris, 1883; E. Caird, *The Social Philosophy and Religion of Comte*, Glasgow, 1885; P. Vallet, *Le Kantisme et la positivisme*, Paris, 1887; A. J. Balfour, *Religion of Humanity*, London, 1888; W. Bender, *Das Wesen der Religion*, Bonn, 1888; W. Cunningham, *The Path towards Knowledge*, pp. 147–163, London, 1891; H. D. Hutton, *Comte, the Man and Founder*, London, 1891; E. de Roberty, *La Philosophie du siècle: criticisme, positivisme, évolutionisme*, Paris, 1891; H. D. Hutton, *Comte's Life and Work Exceptional, but finally Normal*, London, 1892; E. de Roberty, *Aug. Comte et H. Spencer*, Paris, 1894; L. M. Billia, *La Crisi del Positivismo*, Parma, 1895; J. Halleux, *Les Principes du positivisme*, Paris, 1896; C. Hillemand, *La Vie et l'œuvre d'Auguste Comte*, ib. 1898; J. Watson, *Comte, Mill and Spencer*, 2d ed., London, 1898; C. Gilardoni, *Le Positivisme*, Vitry-le-François, 1899; G. de Greef, *Problèmes de philosophie positive*, Paris, 1900; L. Lévy-Bruhl, *La Philosophie d'Auguste Comte*, ib. 1900; P. Batiffol, *Études d'histoire et de théologie positive*, ib. 1902; E. Rignano, *La Sociologie dans le cours de la philosophie positive*, ib. 1902; A. Baumann, *La Religion positive*, ib. 1903; E. Corra, *La Philosophie positive*, ib. 1904; P. Grimanelli, *La Crise morale et le positivisme*, ib. 1904; W. Schmidt, *Der Kampf der Weltanschauungen*, Berlin, 1904; J. H. Bridges, *Illustrations of Positivism*, London, 1907; F. Harrison, *The Creed of a Layman: Apologia pro fide mea*, London and New York, 1907; and cf. list of magazine literature in Richardson, *Encyclopœdia*, pp. 866–867.

POSSESSION, DEMONIACAL. See DEMONIAC.

POSSEVINO, pōs''sê-vî'no, **ANTONIO:** Italian Jesuit, diplomat, and scholar; b. at Mantua 1534; d. at Ferrara Feb. 26, 1611. He was a zealous opponent of Protestantism, first in the Waldensian valleys, and later in France, and especially at Avignon and Lyons. In 1577 Gregory XIII. commissioned him to labor in the cause of recovering the Swedish court and people to the Roman Catholic Church, and as an imperial envoy he made good use of the friendly ties that subsisted, through marriage, with the royal family of Poland. His enterprise failed, however, for the pope would have nothing to do with the ecclesiastical compromises introduced by King John III. Possevino then labored in Poland and Russia until he was recalled to Italy in 1586. Here he devoted himself to literary work, the results including *Apparatus sacer ad scriptores Veteris et Novi Testamenti* (3 vols., Venice, 1603–06); *Moscovia* (Wilna, 1586); and *Bibliotheca selecta studiorum* (2 vols., Rome, 1593).

K. BENRATH.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. d'Origny, *La Vie du Père A. Possevin*, Paris, 1712; Lichtenberger, x. 697–699; *KL*, x. 235–238. An answer to his *Apparatus* was made by T. James, *A Treatise of the Corruption of Scripture . together with a sufficient Answer unto A. Possevine*, London, 1611.

POSSIDIUS, SAINT: Biographer of Augustine; d. after 437 Nothing is known of his life until 390 or 391, except that he was from northern Africa and was a pupil of Augustine and his intimate friend for forty years. In 397 he seems to have been consecrated bishop of Calama in Numidia, and he continually cooperated with Augustine in the struggle against paganism and in the war upon the heretics of the period, Arians, Manicheans, Donatists, Priscillianists, and Pelagians (see AUGUSTINE, SAINT, OF HIPPO). The extirpation of the heretics, especially the Pelagians, was doubtless due to the synodal activity of Augustine and Possidius. Between 394 and 424 Augustine summoned twenty synods mostly at Carthage; and while the signature of the bishop of Calama can scarcely be proved, his energy at one of the Carthaginian synods against the Pelagians won the praise of Innocent I. in his *Inter cæteras Romanæ* of Jan. 27, 417 (*MPL*, xxxiii. 783). In 429 northern Africa

was ravaged by the vandals of Geiserich, and on the destruction of Calama Possidius fled to Hippo, where he was present at the death of Augustine on Aug. 28, 430. According to Prosper of Aquitane, Possidius and other bishops were expelled from Africa in 437 by Geiserich. Henceforth Possidius vanishes from history, and neither the place nor the date of his death is known, though apparently he lived to an advanced age. In the Roman Catholic calendar his day is May 17.

Shortly after 430 Possidius wrote his *Vita Augustini* (ed. J. Salinas, Augsburg, 1764; *MPL*, xxxii. 33–66), a work at once enthusiastic, modest, and reliable. He also made the first collection of the numerous writings of Augustine under the title *Indiculus librorum, tractatuum et epistolarum sancti Augustini Hipponensis episcopi* (*MPL*, xlvi. 5 sqq.), thus doing a valuable service for the earliest textual transmission of his teacher's works.

(Franz Görres.)

Bibliography: The source is his own *Vita Augustini*, ut sup. Consult: *ASB*, May, iv. 27–34; J. Salinas, *De vita et rebus gestis sancti Possidii*, Rome, 1731; Tillemont, *Mémoires*, vol. xiii.; *KL*, x. 238; *DCB*, iv. 445–446; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, vii. 187, 521–522, 562, ix. 22. Some illustrative material will be found in A. Schwarze, *Africanische Kirche*, pp. 83, 145, 154, Göttingen, 1892; F. Görres, in *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft*, x (1893), 14–70; L. Schmidt, *Geschichte der Wandalen*, Leipsic, 1901 (cf. F. Görres in *GGA*, 1902, no. 10, pp. 816–826).

POST, GEORGE EDWARD: Presbyterian; b. in New York City Dec. 17, 1838; d. at Beirut, Syria, Oct. 1, 1909. He was educated at the New York Free Academy (now the College of the City of New York; A.B., 1854), New York University (M.D., 1860), and Union Theological Seminary (1861). He was then a chaplain in the United States Army (1861–63), after which he was a missionary at Tripoli, Syria (1863–67). After 1867 he was professor of surgery at the Syrian Protestant College, Beirut, Syria. He was also surgeon to the Johanniter Hospital, Beirut. In addition to a number of text-books and other works in Arabic, and besides many articles on natural history in leading theological encyclopedias, he wrote *Flora of Syria, Palestine, and Syria from the Taurus to Ras Muhammad, and from the Mediterranean Sea to the Syrian Desert* (Beirut, 1896).

POSTIL: A medieval Latin term for a marginal note or a Biblical commentary affixed to a text, being an abbreviation of the phrase *post illa verba textus*. The word first occurs in the chronicle (with reference to examples of 1228 and 1238) of Nicolas Trivetus, but later it came to mean only homiletic exposition, and thus became synonymous with homily in distinction from the thematic sermon. Finally, after the middle of the fourteenth century, it was applied to an annual cycle of homilies. From the time of Luther, who published the first part of his postil under the title *Enarrationes epistolarum et evangeliorum quas postillas vocant* (Wittenberg, 1521), every annual cycle of sermons on the lessons, whether consisting of homilies or formal sermons, is termed a postil. A few of the most famous Lutheran postils are those of M. Luther (*Kirchenpostille*, Wittenberg, 1527; *Hauspostille*, 1542, 1549), P Melanchthon (*Evangelien-Postille*, Germ., Nuremberg, 1549; Lat., Hanover, 1594), M. Chemnitz (*Evangelien-Postille*, Magdeburg, 1594), L. Osiander (*Bauern-Postille*, Tübingen, 1597), and J. Arndt (*Evangelien-Postille*, Leipsic, 1616).

The term postil fell into disuse during the period of Pietism and the Enlightenment (qq.v.), but was revived by Claus Harms (*Winter-Postille*, Kiel, 1812; *Sommer-Postille*, 1815); and has again become common through W. Löhe (*Evangelien-Postille*, Frommel 1848; *Epistel-Postille*, 1858), and M. Stuttgart (*Herzpostille*, Bremen, 1882, 1890; *Hauspostille*, 1887–88; *Pilgerpostille*, 1890).

The Reformed Church, disregarding a regular series of lessons, has no postils; but in the Roman Catholic Church the term has been kept especially through L. Goffiné (*Hand-Postill oder christ-catholische Unterrichtungen von allen Sonn- und Feyr-Tagen des gantzen Jahrs* (Mainz, 1690; popular, illustrated ed., reissued twenty-one times by H. Herder, Freiburg-im-Breisgau, 1875–1908; Eng. transl., T. Noethen, New York, n.d.).

(W. Holscher.)

POSTMILLENARIANISM. See Millennium, Millenarianism, § 10.

POSTREDEMPTIONISM. See Calvinism, § 9.

POSTULATION: In canon law a legalized procedure of choosing a higher ecclesiastical official where the candidate may be debarred by lacking some of the canonical qualifications or by holding another office which would hinder the legal acceptance of the one to be filled. Through postulation (*postulo*), petition is made for the availability of the person in question for election. Postulation may be simple where it refers to dismission on account of some official impediment; or it may be ceremonial and more real where it refers to canonical defects (of which only minor ones are admissible) or when, for instance, the candidate is the confirmed bishop of a diocese. The proceeding in the case of the simple postulation is like that of election. In the case of the ceremonial an absolute majority is necessary, unless there is competition with a wholly qualified candidate, in which case there is required a majority of two-thirds. After the ceremonial postulation, the candidate made eligible must seek *admissio* just as *confirmatio* after an election. In the case of the rejection of the postulation the power of appointment reverts to the pope. With reference to the Prussian bishoprics as circumscribed in 1821 the distinction between postulation and election was removed.

POTAMIÆNA: Christian slave and martyr at Alexandria. The only two sources of value concerning her, Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.*, VI., v.; Eng. transl., *NPNF*, 2 ser., i. 253) and Palladius (*Historia Lausiaca*, iii.; *MPG*, xxxiv. 1009, 1014), report that Potamiæna belonged to the metropolitan district of Egypt and was a martyr to modesty and chastity rather than to religion. According to Eusebius, she was plunged into a kettle filled with boiling pitch during the reign of Septimius Severus (202–211), a certain Aquila then being president of Alexandria, or according to Palladius in the reign

of Maximinus II. (about 306–310). The account of Eusebius has been subjected to sharp criticism, partly on account of a general resemblance of his description to many forged acts of martyrs. It should be noted, moreover, that, according to Eusebius himself, legend early clustered round Potamiæna's name. It seems probable that Potamiæna was really martyred, as Palladius states, during the persecution of Maximinus, especially as particularly barbarous modes of execution were employed by him; Palladius adds that he heard of her martyrdom, at least indirectly, from St. Anthony, the father of hermits. (Franz Görres.)

Bibliography: The sources are indicated in the text; discussions of these are: B. Aubé, *Les Chrétiens dans l'empire romain*, pp. 132–137, Paris, 1881; P. Allard, *Hist. des persécutions*, ii. 75, 76, ib. 1886; Tillemont, *Mémoires*, iii. 267–273, 511–512; *DCB*, iv. 447.

POTAMIUS: Bishop of Olisipo (Lisbon), c. 357 According to Hilary, *De synodis*, xi., the so-called second Sirmian formula of 357 was drawn up by Hosius and Potamius, while Phœbadius (*Contra Arianos*, iii.) attributes it to Ursacius, Valens, and Potamius. The Luciferian (of San Lucar de Barrameda, Spain) presbyters Faustinus and Marcellinus (*Libellus precum*) report that Potamius merely signed the formula. This latter work implies, moreover, that Hosius was cited to appear at Sirmium by Potamius, whom Hosius had denounced to the churches of Spain as a heretic. The Luciferian presbyters just mentioned also say that Potamius originally held the Catholic faith but denied it through greed for a piece of land, and that he died while on his way to this property. Catholic orthodoxy is shown in a letter of Potamius to Athanasius (written before 357), and he is mentioned, together with Epictetus of Centumcellæ, as an opponent of Liberius at Rimini in 359 (*MPL*, x. 681). In the previous year Phœbadius had seen in him an opponent who would endeavor to carry through the formula, and records a letter by him of Patripassian tendency. Potamius was the author of two brief treatises in barbarous Latin, preserved by Zeno of Verona (*MPL*, viii. 1411–15), *De Lazaro* and *De martyrio Isaiæ prophetæ*.

(Edgar Hennecke.)

Bibliography: H. Florez, *España Sagrada*, xiv. 178 sqq., Madrid, 1754 sqq.; P. B. Gams, *Kirchengeschichte von Spanien*, ii. 1, pp. 224–225, 231 sqq., 315 sqq., Regensburg, 1864; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, iv. 549, v. 152, vi. 274; *DCB*, iv. 448.

POTHINUS (PHOTINUS): Bishop of Lyons; b. 87; d. 177 According to Gallic tradition, he was the first bishop of the see, predecessor of Irenæus, and he may well have been consecrated before 150. The account of his martyrdom, as given in the letter of the church at Lyons on the persecution under Marcus Aurelius (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, V., i. 29–31), reveals the intensity of feeling which prevailed among both Christians and pagans.

(A. Hauck.)

Bibliography: The "Gallic tradition" appears in Gregory of Tours, *Historia Francorum*, i. 29, *In gloria martyrum*, xlviii.–xlix. Consult: Neander, *Christian Church*, i. 112, 677; *DCB*, iv. 449; Schaff, *Christian Church*, ii. 55.

POTTER, ALONZO: Protestant Episcopal bishop; b. at La Grange, Dutchess County, N. Y., July 6, 1800; d. at San Francisco July 4, 1865. He graduated at Union College, Schenectady, 1818; studied theology in Philadelphia; was chosen professor of mathematics and natural philosophy in Union College, about 1821; ordained in 1822; was rector of St. Paul's, Boston, 1826–31; was recalled to the professorship of moral and intellectual philosophy and political economy at Union College in 1832, and was vice-president, 1838–45; and bishop of Pennsylvania, 1845–65. He possessed remarkable executive ability and genius for administration, and by his command of men and means established the Episcopal hospital at Philadelphia, reorganized the Episcopal academy and founded the Philadelphia Divinity School, as well as young men's lyceums and working-men's institutes. Thirty-five new churches in Philadelphia alone during his bishopric attest his energy. He delivered a course of lectures before the Lowell institute in Boston, 1845–49, on Natural Theology and Christian Evidences, without notes, which attracted much attention. He was author of *Discourses, Charges, Addresses, Pastoral Letters* (Philadelphia, 1858); and *Religious Philosophy* (1872).

Bibliography: M. A. de W. Howe, *Memoirs of the Life and Services of Alonzo Potter*, Philadelphia, 1871.

POTTER, HENRY CODMAN: Protestant Episcopal bishop of New York; b. at Schenectady, N. Y., May, 25, 1835; d. at Cooperstown, N. Y., July 21, 1908. He was the son of the preceding, and was educated at the Episcopal Academy, Philadelphia, and the Theological Seminary in Virginia, from which he was graduated in 1857 He was ordered deacon in the same year and priested in 1858. After being curate of Christ Church, Greensburg, Pa. (1857–58), he was rector of St. John's, Troy, N. Y. (1858–66), when he became assistant at Trinity, Boston. Two years later (1868), he accepted a call to New York City as rector of Grace Church, a position which he held until 1883, being also secretary to the House of Bishops from 1863 to 1883, when he was consecrated bishop-coadjutor of New York, assisting his uncle, Bishop Horatio Potter. In 1887 he succeeded to the full administration of the diocese, over which he presided unaided until 1903, when D. H. Greer (q.v.) was consecrated bishop-coadjutor. He was a broadminded man and cultivated the friendliest relations with those outside of his own church. He also had a prominent part in movements for civic reform. He was justly honored and beloved, and will be enrolled among the foremost of American citizens. Among his numerous writings, special mention may be made of his *Sisterhoods and Deaconesses at Home and Abroad* (New York, 1871); *The Gates of the East, a Winter in Egypt and Syria* (1877); *Sermons of the City* (1881); *Waymarks* (1892); *The Scholar and the State* (1897); *Addresses to Women engaged in Church Work* (1898); *The East of To-day and To-Morrow* (1902); *The Citizen in his Relation to Industrial Situation* (1902); *Law and Loyalty* (1903); *Modern Man and his Fellow Man* (1903); and *Reminiscences of Bishops and Archbishops* (1906).

Bibliography: Harriette A. Keyser, *Bishop Potter, the People's Friend*, New York, 1910; W. S. Perry, *The Episcopate in America*, p. 277, ib. 1895.

POTTER, HORATIO: Protestant Episcopal bishop of New York; b. at Beekman, N. Y., Feb. 9, 1802; d. at New York City Jan. 2, 1887 He was educated at Union College (B.A., 1826); became deacon 1827, and priest 1828; was pastor at Saco, Me., 1827–28; professor of mathematics and natural philosophy at Washington (now Trinity) College, 1828–33; rector of St. Peter's, Albany, 1833–54; provisional bishop of New York, 1854–1861, and diocesan bishop after 1861. His administration as rector and as bishop was marked by energy and success, while literary activity took largely the form of sermons.

POTTS, GEORGE: Presbyterian; b. in Philadelphia Mar. 15, 1802; d. in New York Sept. 15, 1864. He was graduated from the University of Pennsylvania, 1819; and studied at Princeton Theological Seminary, 1819–21; was pastor in Natchez, Miss., 1823–36; of Duane Street Church, New York, 1836–44; and of University Place Church, same city, 1845–64. He was an eminent preacher, a leader in religion and philanthropy, a beloved pastor and friend. He had a memorable controversy with Bishop Jonathan Mayhew Wainwright on the claims of the episcopacy upon which he published *No Church without a Bishop* (New York, 1844).

POULSEN, ALFRED SVEISTRUP: Danish bishop; b. in Roskilde (18 m. w. of Copenhagen) Jan. 14, 1854. He was educated at Roskilde School (B.A., 1871) and at the University of Copenhagen (candidate in theology, 1878); after traveling abroad he was appointed minister at St. Hans Hospital and assistant to the provost of the cathedral of Roskilde; was made court preacher in Copenhagen (1883); provost of the cathedral of Roskilde (1896); bishop in Viborg (1901). For several years he was privat-docent in the university of Copenhagen; was made secretary of the Danish Bible Society (1885); president of the Danish mission to the Jews (1890). In collaboration with Professor Ussing he published a revised translation of the New Testament (1895; 2d ed., 1897). Some of his works are *Fra Gethsemane til Emmaus, Faste- og Pestprädikener* (1889); *Fra Kampen om Mosebögerne* (1890); *Philip Melanchthon i Aaret 1521* (1897); *Det nye Testaments Opfattelse af den christelige Fuldkommenhed* (1899); *Prädikener holdte i Roskilde Domkirke* (1901); *Prädikener holdte i Christiansborg Slotskirke* (1896); *Moses. Udlägningsbetragtninger* (1903). JOHN O. EVJEN.

POURING. See BAPTISM, IV., 1, 3,

POVERTY, SUFFERING, AND THE CHURCH. See SOCIAL SERVICE OF THE CHURCH.

POWELL, BADEN: English mathematician and theological writer; b. at Stamford Hill, London, Aug. 22, 1796; d. in London June 11, 1860. He studied at Oriel College, Oxford (B.A., 1817; M.A., 1820); was curate of Midhurst, 1820, and vicar of Plumstead, Kent, 1821–27 From 1827 till his death he was Savilian professor of geometry at Oxford. He opposed the Tractarians, worked for university reform, and was a member of the committee of 1851. In 1860 he contributed to the famous *Essays and Reviews* (q.v.) an essay *On the Study of the Evidences of Christianity*. His position was, in the main, rationalistic. He rejected miracles as being out of harmony with the methods of God's government. His works of theological interest are, *The Connexion of Natural and Divine Truth* (London, 1838); *Tradition Unveiled* (1839; *Supplement*, 1840); *Essays on the Spirit of the Inductive Philosophy, the Unity of Worlds, and the Philosophy of Creation* (1855; 2d ed., 1856); *The Study of the Evidences of Natural Theology* (in *Oxford Essays*, 1856); *Christianity without Judaism* (1857); and *The Order of Nature Considered in Reference to the Claims of Revelation* (1859).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *DNB*, xlvi. 237–238, where other literature is cited. Consult also works cited under *Essays and Reviews*, and cf. the list of works called out by Powell's essay in that volume, given in *British Museum Catalogue* under "Powell, Baden."

POWELL, LYMAN PIERSON: Protestant Episcopalian; b. at Farmington, Del., Sept. 21, 1866. He was educated at Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa., Johns Hopkins University (A.B., 1890), University of Pennsylvania (fellow in history, 1893–95), and the Protestant Episcopal Divinity School, Philadelphia (1897). He was staff lecturer in history in the extension department of the University of Wisconsin (1892–93) and in the American University Extension Society (1893–95). Since ordination he has been rector of Trinity, Ambler, Pa. (1897–98), St. John's, Lansdowne, Pa. (1898–1903), and St. John's, Northampton, Mass. (since 1903). Theologically he is a liberal conservative, and has written: *History of Education in Delaware* (Washington, 1893); *Six Sermons on Sin* (Lansdowne, Pa., 1903); *Family Prayers* (Philadelphia, 1905); *The Anarchy of Christian Science* (Northampton, Mass., 1906); *Christian Science: The Faith and its Founder* (New York, 1907); and *Heavenly Heretics* (1909); besides editing the series *American Historic Towns* (4 vols., New York, 1898–1901).

POWELL, VAVASOR. See FIFTH MONARCHY MEN.

POWER, FREDERICK DUNGLISON: Disciple of Christ; b. at Yorktown, Va., Jan. 23, 1851. He was educated at Bethany College, Bethany, W. Va. (A.B., 1871), where he was adjunct professor of ancient languages in 1874–75, after having held various pastorates in his denomination from 1871 to 1874. Since 1875 he has been pastor of the Vermont Avenue Christian Church, Washington, D.C., and in this capacity was pastor of President James A. Garfield. He was also chaplain of Congress from 1881 to 1883, and since 1898 has been president of the American Christian Missionary Society. He was assistant editor of the *Christian Evangelist*, St. Louis, from 1902 to 1906. Among his writings, special mention may be made of his *Sketches of our Pioneers* (New York, 1898); *Bible Doctrine for Young People* (1899); *The Story of a Twenty-Three Years' Pastorate* (Cincinnati, 1899); *Life of President W K. Pendleton of Bethany College* (St. Louis, 1902); *The Spirit of our Movement* (1902); *History and Doctrine of the Disciples of Christ* (1904); and *Thoughts of Thirty Years* (Boston, 1906).

PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

I. History of the Development of the Science.
Biblical Indications (§ 1).
Early and Medieval Church (§ 2).
In the Reformation and After (§ 3).
Protestant Development (§ 4).
II. Theoretical Discussion.
Basal Concepts (§ 1).
Subdivisions (§ 2).
Bouleutics (§ 3).
Classification (§ 4).
Relation to Non-theological Sciences and Arts (§ 5).
Final Tests (§ 6).

I. History of the Development of the Science: The Christian Church engages in multifarious activities connected with its belief in Christ and characteristic of its life, these including missions, the edification of its members, the performance of public worship, and the care of the poor and needy. All this, as at present discharged, is but a continuation of what the Church has done from the first. Immediately after the ascension, the disciples began to preach in order to win new believers (Acts ii. 36 sqq.); and those so won were baptized (Acts ii. 41) and "continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers" (Acts ii. 42). Similar development took place elsewhere (Rom. vi. 3; I Cor. xi. 20, xii. 13, 28; Gal. iii. 27); the gentile Christians received specific rules of conduct (Acts xv. 20); the sick were the objects of special religious rites (James v. 14–15); and the imposition of hands was used in ordination (Acts vi. 6, xiii. 3; I Tim. iv. 14, v. 22). The discharge of all these duties led to the emergence of special persons to perform them. Christ himself had chosen certain ones to continue his work (Matt. xxviii. 18–20), and the title of apostle, which he had given them (Luke vi. 13), could be conferred by the Christian community (Gal. i. 1), and might even be assumed falsely (II Cor. xi. 13; Rev. ii. 2). Other designations were also used; ruler (cf. Rom. xii. 8; Heb. xiii. 7, 17, 24), elder (Acts xi. 30, xiv. 23; James v. 14), bishop (Phil. i. 1), prophet (Acts xi. 27), teacher (Acts xiii. 1), evangelist (Acts xxi. 8), servant (Phil. i. 1). See ORGANIZATION OF THE EARLY CHURCH.

1. Biblical Indications.

Before long, as may be seen from the Didache (q.v.), a system of regulation was evolved, both in ritual and legislation, although preaching, in particular, could not so strictly be outlined. The germs of practical theology lay in all these things. From this came Liturgics, Symbolics (qq.v.), Catechetics (see CATECHESIS, CATECHETICS), Homiletics (q.v.), and the rules governing the various orders of clergy, as well as ecclesiastical functions themselves; and to this same early period belong such efforts at practical theology as Chrysostom's *De sacerdotio*, Augustine's *De doctrina Christiana*, Ambrose's *De officiis*, and Gregory's *Regula pastoralis*. Medieval theology devoted most attention to liturgics, next to canon law, of those branches now considered parts of practical theology. This fact was due to problems arising in the life of the Church. Thus the need of instructing the clergy in their duties gave rise to the *De ecclesiasticis officiis* of Isidore of Seville, the *De exordiis* of Walafrid Strabo, and the *De institutione clericorum* of Rabanus Maurus. These and similar writings discussed, from the medieval point of view, themes which would now be regarded as parts of liturgics and pastoral theology, with an attempt to gain a historical foundation and explanation for the subjects treated. Homiletics, on the other hand, received comparatively scant attention, as contrasted with the discussions of liturgics by Rupert of Deutz, Honorius of Autun, Sicardus, and Durand; while the development of catechetics was prevented by the fact that medieval catechizing was restricted to the hearing of texts and the reading of authorized interpretations.

2. Early and Medieval Church.

The fathers of the Reformation churches sought to establish and regulate, so far as possible, worship, feasts, administration, and the duties of clergy and congregation, this being exemplified in such agenda as those of Bugenhagen, Brandenburg-Nuremberg, Pomerania, and Electoral Palatinate (see AGENDA). While the pastor, though not the only person concerned in the church, was yet the chief figure, his activity in its various aspects was the main theme of the agenda, and pastoral activity accordingly formed the center of practical theology. But it was not enough merely to lay down rules; the pastor must know what he did and why. Directions and theoretical bases must, therefore, be included, and these are found in the Brandenburg-Nuremberg agenda and similar early Reformation documents, which commingle subjects belonging to dogmatic, exegetical, historical, and practical theology, though all intended was to subserve correct ecclesiastical procedure. One side required still more profound discussion—preaching; and the agendas accordingly gave models for the preacher or referred him to recognized authorities. Side by side with the official agendas arose compends of all that the pastor must know, do, and claim, these being Protestant analogues to the Roman *Institutio* of Rabanus and the *Manuale curatorum* of Surgantius. Since in Luther the Lutherans saw the model of a pastor, and since he had devoted no special treatise to this matter, Porta, shortly after the Reformer's death, compiled from his writings a *Pastorale Lutheri*, similar productions being the *Hirtenbuch* of E. Sarcerius (1559), the *Pastor* of N. Hemming (1566), the *Hirt* of Zwingli (1525), the *Pastorale* of Lorich (1537), and the *De cura animarum* of Butzer (1538). All these authors seek their basis in the Bible, and a similar course was pursued with rigidity by Andreas Hyperius (q.v.), who held that before practical theology can be put in force, it must be made a part of scientific theological study, and must be taught systematically, not fragmentarily. Demanding an immense amount of preliminary reading on the part of the student, covering all practical theology except missions, he held that such reading would in-

3. In the Reformation and After.

volve preparation for the practical work of the ministry. All must be squared with the Bible, or, where the Bible did not contain specific data, with the commandments of love for God and one's neighbor. In addition, he urged the preparation of a work on church government, including the data of the New Testament, relevant portions of church history, excerpts from the councils, papal decrees, Church Fathers, and works on dogmatics, liturgics, and the like. Both Reformed and Lutheran theologians were influenced by Hyperius, but they limited themselves to parts of practical theology, declining to erect the massive structure he desired. Protestant tenets required that the clergyman be above all things primarily a preacher, while medieval writers had deemed him rather a liturgist. Practical theology, though not under that name and not in all its parts, gained its place in the methodology of theological study mainly as a system of homiletics.

All theology being, either immediately or mediately, practical, the name practical theology must be deemed a restriction of the designation of the whole to a part. The wide extensibility of the word "practical" led to its application to Christian ethics and to church activities, for which the study of theology both in general and in its parts, as homiletics or ethics, formed the preparation. It is remarkable that in all early discussions of practical theology, as by Alsted, Gisbert Voetius, and J. Forster, catechetics is lacking, though the second-named divides the theme into moral (or casuistic), ascetic, politico-ecclesiastical, and homiletic theology. There was, indeed, a catechetic theology, but this was construed as the knowledge of the chief tenets of Christianity which the theologian must have for himself, not as a theory of church instruction. It was not until the rise of Pietism that catechetics became an integral part of practical theology. It was in the transition from the eighteenth to the nineteenth century that the several parts of practical theology were recognized as an organic whole, which was designated "practical theology." J. E. C. Schmid, in his *Theologische Encyklopädie* (1810), and G. J. Planck (q.v.) in his *Grundriss* (1813), adopted this terminology, both speaking of it as the one customarily used. It is thus impossible to regard Schleiermacher as the founder of practical theology, even in the sense that it owed to him its scientific existence. At the same time, he essentially furthered it by his *Kurze Darstellung* (1811, 1830) and by his lectures, and gave it systematic development. While positing the mutual interdependence of scientific and practical theology, the latter is regarded as the crown of theological study, since it presupposes all the other branches and prepares for their realization. Schleiermacher's construction of the subdivisions of practical theology was conditioned by his theory of the Church, which he held to be the community of Christian life for the independent exercise of Christianity. Since this presupposes organization, church administration rests on a distinct formulation of the original antithesis between leaders and led. This administration is in the hands of the leaders, or theologians, and Christian theology is the content of knowledge and regulation without which the harmonious administration of the Church is impossible. The community may connote either individual congregation or denomination, and from the religious life of the former Schleiermacher constructed homiletics, liturgics, catechetics, missions, and pastoral care. From this point of view, practical theology includes the traditional subdivisions with the addition of missions. The administration of the denomination as a whole Schleiermacher sought in ecclesiastical authority and in the free power of the spirit, both having ultimately the same end, but the former enacting or restraining, while the latter inspires and admonishes, so that the excellence of religious condition is directly proportionate to the living interaction of these two factors. The interest of the nexus between the individual congregation and the denomination is subserved by church legislation, which affects liturgy and usage, the membership of individuals in the Church, and discipline and the building of churches. It thus preserves both free development and unity, besides guarding the relations of Church and State, and to it is also assigned, especially to the theological teacher and author, the task of pointing out the norm which he must follow if his activity is to benefit the entire body of his communion. In all this Schleiermacher's importance lies in the fact that he gave these elements systematic discussion on the basis of church government. The historical treatment, on the other hand, was less emphasized, and both this side and the systematic aspect received elaboration and development from Schleiermacher's successors, the most important being Karl Immanuel Nitzsch (q.v.).

4. Protestant Development.

II. Theoretical Discussion: The derivation of practical theology from the essence of the Church and the concept of the Church itself as the subject and object of that theology have been maintained, with various modifications, from the time of Schleiermacher. Mention may be made of such theologians as P K. Marheineke, A. Schweizer, Nitzsch, and F. A. E. Ehrenfeuchter (qq.v.). Ehrenfeuchter however, seems to exclude missions from practical theology. But this difficulty is solved when it is remembered that in its missionary activity the Church follows the impulse to recover what really appertains to it. The problem recurs more cogently in the case of home missions, and in so far as such missions depart from their original character and are devoted to charitable and humanitarian ends, they come under the category of ethics rather than of practical theology. The means for accomplishing that church activity with which practical theology is concerned are generally agreed to be prayer, preaching, and the sacraments, the congregation being the agent in the first, and God in the two latter. Since the object of this activity is the congregation itself, practical theology must distinguish between the congregation as united with the risen Christ in faith and as living in this world. A distinction is accordingly drawn between the congregation as existent (in possession of the means of communion and of the spirit necessary to such com-

1. Basal Concepts.

munion) and as nascent (subject to the influences of earthly life); and all this church activity ultimately leads to the great distinction between persons who act and persons who are acted upon.

2. Subdivisions.

Turning to the traditional and generally recognized subdivisions of practical theology it is clear that homiletics and catechetics belong together in so far as both are concerned with the Word for the congregation, the difference being that homiletics deals with the trained and catechetics with the untrained. The object of liturgics is less clear, but some light may be gained by reckoning under it the theory of the prayer of the congregation. It may then include hymnology and music, as well as confirmation, confession, marriage, and burial. It is true that all these belong in part to the theory of the Word, but their specific content appertains to the theory of the prayer of the congregation. Here, too, belong the dedication of objects, which God is besought to give to the right people, and to endow with his spirit. The theory of the administration of the sacraments is meager if only the ceremonies be described; but this administration depends upon other problems, such as the justification of infant baptism. The position of pastoral theology is peculiar. Formerly, as still among Roman Catholic theologians, it included all practical theology; and traces of this excess still survive even among Protestants, so that it involves both pastoral duties in general and individual pastoral care. It is best, however, to restrict pastoral duties in general to the functions of the personage entrusted with the discharge of the major part of that with which practical theology is concerned, and to confine pastoral care to the special needs of individual cases (see Pastoral Theology). If this be done, the two subdivisions can not be combined, a fact which is to the advantage of both. Home missions are a special extension of individual pastoral care, so that it is unnecessary for practical theology to treat it as a special subdivision. Since, however, home missions do not employ pastors, pastoral theology should no longer be restricted to pastors, but should be extended to deacons and deaconesses. It must, accordingly, be transformed into a theory of the officials of the congregation, and thus of the entire organization of the Church. In this way pastoral theology becomes the last of the subdivisions of practical theology; after the activities of the Church have been set forth, the theory of the persons performing them forms the conclusion. The theory of the church year and of the Pericopes (q.v.) forms part of Homiletics (q.v.), shading over into Liturgics (q.v.). The position of foreign missions (see Missions to the Heathen) in practical theology is uncertain, but E. C. Achelis is probably right in placing them immediately before the theory of church government, for activity directed toward an already existing Church must first be treated, and then that directed toward the non-Christian world. The missionary theory of practical theology must not invade church history or the training of missionaries, but must be restricted to the position to be maintained by the Church in missionary activity and to the means for rousing missionary enthusiasm within the congregation.

3. Bouleutics.

J. C. K. von Hoffmann (q.v.) has added to the functions of theological and ecclesiastical activity the learned representation and counsel of the Church, these being discharged by the theologian in his *ex-officio* capacity as a member of the religious community. From this point of view apologetics and polemics would fall within the scope of practical theology, though these would still have to be furnished by the exegete, historian, and dogmatician, practical theology requiring them simply in the interests of the present-day Church. For this learned counsel von Hoffmann coins the word "bouleutics," which, though without theoretical development, is furthered not only by theological thought, but also by periodicals and pamphlets. Such voluntary counsel, however, can be beneficial only when based on a solid foundation, and while practical theology must indeed afford counsel, this must be accomplished through the theoretical development of the duties of the Church, not through a special system of bouleutics. Practical theology itself must perform the office of bouleutics for all ecclesiastical tasks and duties, and from its concentration on the present life and activity of the community it follows that it must be denominational in character.

4. Classification.

In the light of the foregoing, the means of the life of the religious community may be classified as follows: the theory of the prayer of the congregation (liturgics), of the Word for the trained and untrained (homiletics and catechetics), the administration of the sacraments, care for those members of the congregation who are cut off from its life (pastoral care) and for the non-Christian world (foreign missions), and the theory of the officiants and their duties (theory of the officials of the congregation). More important than this classification is the problem whether practical theology has its own field, whether it is separate from exegetical, systematic, and historical theology, or whether it is to be referred to them. In the first place, practical theology is concerned with the establishment of an actual state of things, all other theology with the knowledge of such a state. Again, practical theology is the theory of the technic of the right administration of the ecclesiastical means of community, prayer, preaching, and the sacraments. It is undeniable that practical theology needs the aid of other departments of theology, but since these are often inadequate for its requirements, it is obliged to supplement them in all their capacities. But it remains throughout essentially "applied theology," and it accordingly treats all the material supplied by the other departments of theology in a distinctly characteristic fashion, developing the practical application of such material in church life and the theoretical basis of such application. Between the theory of the nature of any theological activity (e.g., baptism) and the performance of such activity lies the theory of its performance, and this theory is the specialty of practical theology.

Practical theology also sustains a close relation to

certain non-theological sciences and arts in consequence of the training of theologians and the peculiar nature of Christian worship, and modern conditions demand that the theologian engaged in practical work have more than has been included in his professional education. It is not, however, the function of practical theology to supply this need, any more than it is the duty of exegesis or church history to do so. Despite the fortuitous combination (for example) of homiletics with rhetoric, or of catechetics with pedagogics, practical theology can and should, in reality, supply its own needs in these respects from within itself. This division of theology also bears a relation to the fine arts, for though these sustain no essential connection with practical theology, yet the construction and adornment of a church edifice appertains to architecture, sculpture, and painting, sacramental vessels may be artistically embellished, and parts of the service may be rendered in poetic or musical setting. In so far as art furthers religious ends, it may be employed by practical theology; when it passes beyond these limits, it must be rejected.

5. Relation to Non-theological Sciences and Arts.

A far more difficult problem is the proof of the correctness of the theory of practical theology. On Protestant principles this must be accomplished by the Bible, a task which is not easy. While many details can not be proved from indisputable Bible passages, the attempt must be made to gain from the New Testament such a general view of church life as shall include all the vital functions of the congregation, all the powers conferred upon it, all its activities and experiences, all its personages, all its relations to the non-Christian world, and the consequent position of its Lord and the leaders of its life. This reconstruction must run through the entire New Testament, and from it will be gained a picture of the Christian Church in all its aspects, as well as a survey of the agencies to serve for its guidance and a basis for the procedure to be adopted by it at the present day. For all this a thorough knowledge of church history is essential, and modern practical theology is, fortunately, seeking to gain this knowledge. Since, moreover, church activity is always directed toward the Church at the present time, a complete knowledge of that present is essential to practical theology, and it must also furnish the ways and means whereby those engaged in practical church work can acquire this knowledge. This can not be attained, however, by mere references to books. Practical theology must concern itself, besides all else, with the relations between congregations, the correct questioning of the laity, and the proper mode of pastoral visiting. In this way it aids in finding the way for the correct performance of what has been ascertained to be the right mode of church activity.

6. Final Tests.

(W. CASPARI.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY. G. J. Planck, *Einleitung in die theologische Wissenschaft*, Göttingen, 1794; F. Schleiermacher, *Kurze Darstellung des theologischen Studiums*, pp. 257–338, Berlin, 1830; idem, *Die praktische Theologie*, ed. Frerichs, ib. 1850; A. Schweizer, *Ueber Begriff und Eintheilung der praktischen Theologie*, Leipsic, 1830; C. Schmidt, *De l'objet de la théologie pratique*, Strasburg, 1844; C. B. Moll, *Das System der praktischen Theologie*, Halle, 1853; A. Vinet, *Théologie pastorale*, Paris, 1854, Eng. transl., Edinburgh, 1855; F. A. E. Ehrenfeuchter, *Die praktische Theologie*, Göttingen, 1859; C. I. Nitzsch, *Praktische Theologie*, 3 vols., Bonn, 1859–68; J. H. Blunt, *Directorium Pastorale*, London, 1864; W. Otto, *Evangelische praktische Theologie*, 2 vols., Gotha, 1869–70; F. L. Steinmeyer, *Beiträge zur praktischen Theologie*, 5 vols., Berlin, 1874–79; T. Harnack, *Praktische Theologie*, 2 vols., Erlangen, 1877–78; K. Harms, *Pastoral theologie*, 3 vols., Kiel, 1878; J. J. van Oosterzee, *Practical Theology*, New York, 1878; G. von Zezschwitz, *System der praktischen Theologie*, Leipsic, 1879 (orderly and complete); W. G. Blaikie, *For the Work of the Ministry; a Manual of homiletical and pastoral Theology*, London, 1878; E. Vaucher, *De la théologie pratique*, Paris, 1893 (clear and able); G. R. Crooks and J. F. Hurst, *Theological Encyclopædia and Methodology*, pp. 500 sqq., New York, 1894; A. Cave, *Introduction to Theology*, pp. 565 sqq., Edinburgh, 1896; K. Knoke, *Grundriss der praktischen Theologie*, Göttingen, 1896; E. C. Achelis, *Lehrbuch der praktischen Theologie*, Leipsic, 1898 (satisfactory); idem, *Grundriss der praktischen Theologie*, Freiburg, 1899; F. L. Chapell, *Biblical and Practical Theology*, Philadelphia, 1901; F. S. Schenck, *Modern Practical Theology*, New York, 1903; L. Emery, *Introduction à l'étude de la théologie protestante*, pp. 185–222, Paris, 1904; F. C. Monfort, *Applied Theology*, Cincinnati, 1905; J. Haase, *Der praktische Geistliche*, Hamburg, 1905; W. Faber, in *Kultur der Gegenwart*, I., 4, Berlin, 1906; D. D. Cullen, *Problems of Pulpit and Platform*, Elgin, Ill., 1907; A. Pollok, *Studies in Practical Theology*, London, 1907; J. C. Wright, *Thoughts on Modern Church Life and Work*, New York, 1909; C. Clemen, *Quellenbuch zur praktischen Theologie*, 1, *Quellen zur Lehre vom Gottesdienst (Liturgik)*, 2, *Quellen zur Lehre vom Religionsunterricht*, Giessen, 1910; H. Jeffs, *Modern Minor Prophets. With a Chapter on Lay-Preaching and its By-Products*, London, 1910. Series of works are: *Handbibliothek der praktischen Theologie*, ed. F. Zimmer, 17 vols., Gotha, 1890–93; and *Sammlung von Lehrbüchern der praktischen Theologie*, ed. H. Hering, Berlin, 1895 sqq. (still in progress). Consult also the literature under PASTORAL THEOLOGY.

PRÆDESTINATUS, LIBER: A work of the first half of the fifth century by an unknown author, so called because the list of heresies in the first book closes with the *hæresis prædestinatorum*. The treatise is in three parts: the first being a brief description of ninety heresies, plagiarized from the similar list by Augustine, the notes by the author being without value. The second and third books contain a detailed refutation of the heresy stigmatized as predestinational, this being presented in the second book as a treatise of the opponents, and assailed section by section in the third book. The second book is alleged by the author of the *Liber prædestinatus* to be a forged work of Augustine, designed to propagate dangerous errors concerning predestination and to lead to moral laxity. While this portion might have been written by some adherent of Augustine, it seems rather a figment of the author of the *Prædestinatus*, who skilfully availed himself of Augustinian concepts and methods to present those points of the doctrine of predestination which were most vulnerable to the Pelagians. Whether, or to what extent, the author made use of earlier Pelagian compositions of similar tendency can not be determined. In the third book the Augustinian doctrines are boldly assailed. Free will precedes grace, nor is the greater power of the latter effectual without the antecedence of the former. The fall did not destroy the freedom of the will, but first revealed it; and the end of man is voluntary obedience to God after the pattern of

Christ. The book, though ostensibly orthodox, is Pelagian; and the formal condemnation of Pelagianism is probably a clever effort to blind the simple reader. The *Liber prædestinatus* can not have been written by Arnobius the Younger (q.v.), and it may be the work of several hands, its purpose perhaps being to induce the pope to intervene in favor of the Pelagians. Such a proceeding would not have been at variance with the methods of Julian of Eclanum (q.v.). (ERWIN PREUSCHEN.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The editio princeps, ed. J. Sirmond, appeared Paris, 1643, reprint with a *Censura* . . , 1645; best ed. by La Baum in *Opera varia J Sirmondi*, i. 449 sqq., ib. 1696; it is in *MPL*, liii. 583 sqq.; and in *CSEL*. The earlier literature is antiquated by H. von Schubert, in *TU*, xxiv (1903), part 4; cf. A. Faure, *Die Widerlegung der Hæretiker im 1. Buch des Prædestinatus*, Göttingen, 1903.

PRÆDINIUS, REGNERUS: Dutch Roman Catholic; b. at Winsum, province of Groningen, in 1510; d. at Groningen Apr. 18, 1559. At an early age he went to Groningen, where he studied in the house of the Brethren of the Common Life, where he was the room-mate of Albert Hardenberg (q.v.), who, with other liberal-minded men, formed the sphere of Prædinius' development. He studied theology of the Erasmian type at Louvain until about 1529, and was appointed rector of St. Martin's school, Groningen, some time before 1546, and held this position until his death. He lectured on theology, appealing constantly to the authority of the Bible and predicting that the Church would be reformed under the guidance of learning. Though in sympathy with the two principles of the Reformation, the free study of the Bible and justification by faith alone, and though studying the writings of the Reformers, he was, under the spiritual influence of his masters Wessel and Erasmus, less drawn to the frequently violent Luther and, being a prudent and impassionate spirit, preferred to remain in the background and teach quietly. Many of his pupils, however, who came from Germany, Italy, Spain, France, and Poland, actively promoted the cause of the Reformation, among them David Chytræus (q.v.), and Joannes Acronius, who edited his *Opera* (Basel, 1563). As an outcome of his influence, some of his pupils in the ministry dispensed the Eucharist in both kinds, preached in the vernacular, and laid no value on processions and ceremonies.

Though long permitted to spread his views unmolested, Prædinius was at last accused of heresy and condemned to banishment, but died before the sentence could be carried into effect. Soon after his death his writings were placed on the Index. In one of these, "The Invocation of the Saints," he rejects the practise as inefficacious and contrary to Scripture. (S. D. VAN VEEN.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. J. Diest Lorgion, *Regnerus Prædinius*, Groningen, 1862; *Effigies et vitæ professorum Academiæ Groningæ*, pp. 36 sqq., Groningen, 1654; Suffridus Petrus, *De scriptoribus Frisiæ*, pp. 164 sqq., Franeker, 1669; D. Gerdes, *Historia Reformationis*, vol. iii., Groningen, 1742.

PRÆMUNIRE: A term of English canon and common law including in its signification a certain offense, the writ granted upon it, and its punishment. The term is the first word of the writ, and means "to protect, secure, warn." This writ was originally used by Edward III. in 1353 to check the arrogant encroachments of the papal power. He forbade (27 st. 1, c. 1), under certain penalties, any of his subjects, particularly the clergy, to go to Rome there to answer to things properly within the king's jurisdiction; and also the reception from the pope of English ecclesiastical preferments. By these statutes Edward endeavored in vain to remove a crying evil. Richard II. issued similar statutes in 1393, particularly one called thenceforth the "Statute of Præmunire," assigning as the punishment for the offense that the offenders be imprisoned during life, and lose their lands and other property. Henry IV. and later sovereigns have given the same name and penalty (known as a Præmunire) to different offenses which have only this in common, that they involve more or less insubordination to royal authority.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The first statute is given in English Laws, 27 Edward III., Stat. 1. Eng. transl., Gee and Hardy, *Documents*, pp. 103–104; cf. *KL*, vi. 48–50.

PRÆTORIUS, ABDIAS (GOTTSCHALK SCHULZE): German Lutheran; b. at Salzwedel (54 m. n.n.w. of Magdeburg) Mar. 28, 1524; d. at Wittenberg Jan. 9, 1573. He was educated at Frankfort-on-the-Oder and Wittenberg, coming under the influence of Melanchthon and remaining an ardent Philippist (see PHILIPPISTS) throughout his life. After being teacher (1544–48) and rector (1548–53) in his native city, he was called to be rector of the Altstädtisches Gymnasium at Magdeburg, teaching Greek and Hebrew, preparing a new system of government for the school (1553), and holding public disputations, especially on theological topics; until, in 1558 or 1557, he went to Frankfort-on-the-Oder as professor of Hebrew. Here he soon became the theological protagonist of the Melanchthonian faction in the controversy between the Lutherans and Philippists (q.v.; and see MUSCULUS, ANDREAS), but with the triumph of Lutheranism over Philippism in 1563, Prætorius' position in the university became untenable. Previous to this, however, he had been repeatedly employed by the elector, Joachim II., in affairs of Church and State, attending the three disputations held in Joachim's presence at Berlin with the papal legate Commendone and a Jesuit in Feb., 1561, as well as disputing on the Eucharist at Frankfort in November of the same year with envoys of the king of Hungary. In June of the following year he was sent to Warsaw as the elector's ambassador, and early in September, in a like capacity, signed the protocol of the convention held at Fulda, while in October Joachim took him and his opponent Agricola to the Diet of Frankfort. In 1563, with the fall of Philippism in Frankfort, Prætorius removed to Wittenberg, though he still remained on terms of personal friendship with the elector. He was a member of the philosophical faculty, and became dean in 1571. (P. WOLFF†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: References to early literature are given in Hauck-Herzog, *RE*, xv. 612. Consult *ADB*, xxvi. 513–514; *KL*, x. 276; G. Holstein, *Das altstädtische Gymnasium zu Magdeburg*, in *Jahrbuch für Philologie und Pädagogik*, cxxx (1884), 68 sqq.

PRÆTORIUS, STEPHAN: German Lutheran; b. at Salzwedel (54 m. n.n.w. of Magdeburg), probably May 3, 1536; d. at Neustadt May 5, 1603. He was educated at the University of Rostock, where he also taught in the local schools; was ordained by Agricola at Berlin in 1565; became preacher in the same year at the monastery of the Holy Ghost at Salzwedel, and soon after deacon of the Church of St. Mary's; and from 1569 until his death pastor at Neustadt. A great admirer of Luther, and an opponent of Jesuitism and Calvinism alike, Prætorius laid great stress on the sacraments, though not in the Roman Catholic sense, and held to justification by faith, though he also insisted on purity of life. He was a precursor of J. Arndt and P. Spener (qq.v.), though not Pietist in the narrow sense. His lack of caution brought upon him the charges of antinomianism and perfectionism, the latter theory later even being called Prætorianism. Through his tracts, which he or his friends published after 1570, Prætorius exercised an influence far beyond his own congregation; these were collected and published by J. Arndt under the title *Acht-und-fünfzig schöne, auserlesene, geist- und trostreiche Traktätlein* (Lüneburg, 1622), containing also fourteen hymns with their melodies, one of them being "Was hat gethan der heilige Christ?"

Prætorius' tracts were later arranged in the form of dialogues, with certain moderations, by M. Statius in his *Geistliche Schatzkammer der Gläubigen* (Lüneburg, 1636, and often). There arose over his writings the Prætorian controversy, Abraham Calovius (q.v.) assailing the view of Prætorius and Statius that the faithful possess salvation not only in prospect but in reality. Spener's antagonist, G. C. Dilfeld, considered Prætorius akin to Esaias Stiefel (q.v.), and the general superintendent of Greifswald, Tiburtius Rango, secured the prohibition of the *Schatzkammer* in Swedish Pomerania. Despite all this, Prætorius' writings were continually read, and in the second quarter of the seventeenth century they influenced a circle of converts in Kottbus and vicinity. Spener frequently alludes to him admiringly, and the *Schatzkammer* has been revised by the Kornthal pastor J. H. Stoudt (Stuttgart, 1869). (P. Wolff†.)

Bibliography: J. F. Danneil, *Kirchengeschichte der Stadt Salzwedel*, Halle, 1842; C. J. Cosack, *Zur Geschichte der evangelischen asketischen Litteratur in Deutschland*, pp. 1 sqq., Basel, 1875; H. Beck, *Die Erbauungslitteratur der evangelischen Kirche Deutschlands*, pp. 222 sqq., Erlangen, 1883; C. Grosse, *Die alten Tröster*, p. 97, Hermannsburg, 1900. Earlier and less accessible literature is named in Hauck-Herzog, *RE*, xv. 615.

PRAGMATIC SANCTION: In the period of the later Roman Empire, a solemn rescript of the emperor, especially one issued on matters of public law upon motion of a city, province, or church. It is called "pragmatic" because issued after consultation and negotiation concerning the matter (*pragmo*). Of enactments affecting the Church three are to be mentioned:

I. The *sanctio pragmatica* referred to Louis the Pious of France, of 1268 (1269), if genuine, would be one of the earliest edicts of the thirteenth century to check the excessive extension of the papal power and the abuses of the Curia; particularly with reference to the inordinate demand for revenue and the enlargement of the papal reservation with reference to appointments. Of the six articles included, the first guarantees to all prelates, patrons, and ordinary collators of benefices their plenary rights and the unrestricted maintenance of their jurisdiction; and art. 4 complements the former by providing that all promotions, bestowals, fiefs, and dispositions must conform with the provisions of the common law and of the earlier councils, and the early institution of the Fathers. Art. 3 secures to cathedrals and other churches freedom of elections, promotions, and collatures, without, however, infringing upon the privileges of the king with reference to the appointment of prelates, the granting of the permission for an election, the right of the Regale (q.v.), and the royal investiture. Art. 4 also prohibits simony. Art. 5 permits papal revenues and other obligations only on justifiable, pious, and urgent grounds and only with the approval of the king. Art. 6 guarantees the liberties, prerogatives, and privileges granted by the French kings to churches, monasteries, and sacred institutions as well as to the clergy of the realms. The opponents of Gallicanism (q.v.), however, have earnestly disputed the genuineness of the law, so that in France there remains scarcely a doubt of its forgery. In Germany opinion was divided until P Scheffer-Boichorst (*Gesammelte Schriften*, i. 255, Berlin, 1904) established the forgery beyond a doubt. He placed its origin in the year 1438; others, in 1452.

II. The pragmatic sanction of Bourges by Charles VII. of France was issued July 7, 1438, in consequence of a national synod at Bourges (May, 1438), which indorsed the greater number of the reform edicts of the Council of Basel (q.v.) but proposed certain modifications as affecting the French Church. The edict consisted of twenty-three articles. The decrees which were accepted were incorporated bodily. Above all, the French church and the law of the State affecting the Church thereby adopted unchanged the decrees of the superiority of the council to the pope, the regular convening of ecumenical councils, and the restrictions of papal reservations and revenues. The modifications covered the maintenance of the right of nomination for the king and princes of fit candidates, the extension of the rights of the qualified in the awarding of benefices, the preservation of ordinary jurisdiction over against the conduct of processes by general councils; compensation to the pope for the abolition of annats and the preservation of special customs, observances, and statutes of the French Church. Internal ecclesiastical affairs thus became subject for secular enactment. The modifications intended for the acceptance of the Council of Basel were put in power by the royal edict, though the council could no longer resolve upon their acceptance or rejection. The sanction was naturally opposed by the popes in their effort to regain prestige. Pius II., in 1453, pronounced it to be an infringement upon the papal prerogatives and ordered the French bishops to effect its repeal. When Louis IX. repealed the sanction in 1461, the parliament of Paris, under the protection of which it had been placed, refused; and it has remained essentially

unchanged. See CONCORDATS AND DELIMITING BULLS, III., 2.

III. The so-called German pragmatic sanction of Mar. 26, 1439, never became a law and the term is misleading. At the Diet of Mainz the electoral princes and the representatives of the Roman king and of the absent princes, after the example of the French, adopted a series of the decrees of the Council of Basel, and demanded certain modifications, and considered certain other proposed alterations to be submitted to the council. The act was, however, never approved or proclaimed by royal rescript and has been pointed out as merely a provisional union of the individual German princes concerning their attitude toward the conflict between the pope and the council.

(E. FRIEDBERG.)

Pragmatic sanction is the name given also to the document by which Emperor Charles VI. attempted to secure his Austrian possessions to his daughter Maria Theresa (cf. J. H. Robinson and C. A. Beard, *Development of Modern Europe*, i. 61 sqq., 68, Boston, 1907; *Cambridge Modern History*, vi. 201, New York, 1909).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: I. The document is printed in Mansi, *Concilia*, xxiii. 1259; M. de Lauriere, *Ordonnances des roys de France*, i. 97, Paris, 1723; and Durand de Maillane, *Dictionnaire du droit canonique*, iv. 767, Lyons, 1770. Consult: R. Thomassy, *De la pragmatique sanction attribuée à Saint Louis*, Paris, 1844; C. Gérin, *La Pragmatique Sanction de Saint Louis*, ib. 1870; J. Haller, *Papsttum und Kirchenreform*, i. 202, Berlin, 1903. II. Reprints are in Durand de Maillane, ut sup., p. 768; M. de Vilevault, *Ordonnances des rois de France*, xiii. 267 sqq.; a reprint with notes is dated Paris, 1514, and another, 1666. Consult: H. Dansin, *Hist. du gouvernement de la règne de Charles VII.*, pp. 216 sqq., Paris, 1858; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, vii. 762; W. Schäffner, *Geschichte der Rechtsverfassung Frankreichs*, ii. 630 sqq., 4 vols., Frankfort, 1845–50; E. Friedberg, *Grenzen zwischen Staat und Kirche*, pp. 488 sqq., Tübingen, 1872. III. J. Horix, *Concordata nationis Germanicæ integra*, Frankfort, 1765 sqq.; G. Koch, *Sanctio pragmatica Germanorum illustrata*, Strasburg, 1789.

PRAGMATISM: The word in its technical use originated with C. S. Pierce in 1878 ("How to Make Our Ideas Clear," in *Popular Science Monthly*, xii. 286–302), who defines the meaning of an idea or an object in terms of its practical bearings. An object is known so far as it is conceived in its effects. In 1898 Prof. William James broadened the term to include particular future consequences in experience whether active or passive (*Journal of Philosophy*, i. 674). Hence the truth or meaning of a conception is exhausted in the results of it in an experience which is either recommended or expected. If the consequences of one idea are not conceivably different from those of another idea, the two ideas are essentially the same. Pragmatism deals neither with the abstract nor with the pure metaphysical absolute but wholly with the concrete. It turns away from first causes to contemplate final results. It is a theory for unifying experience through its consequences, and so arriving at truth. The chief representatives of this doctrine, while in general agreement, emphasize somewhat different aspects of the subject. Professor James, e.g., keeps close to everyday experience—pragmatism; Ferdinand Canning Scott Schiller accentuates the place of feeling in relation to religious faith—humanism, personalism; Professor John Dewey is interested more in the scientific inductive approach to knowledge—instrumentalism or immediate empiricalism, i.e., theories are instrumental as derived from and leading to conduct in which we can rest—things are what they are experienced to be and are valid so far as they are workable. Truth is some claim which has been tested and confirmed by the worth of its consequences or at least by the verifiability of these. It is, therefore, not static but progressive, not absolute but a continuous compromise in which warring interests are held in check until wider values emerge in experience wherein they are adjusted and harmonized. Accordingly, authority is not fixed and final but developmental and transitive, in which external coercion gives place to rational self-direction. The bearings of this doctrine on ethics and religion are of great significance. If the entire world is what we make it, human life itself must share this potentiality. That becomes real which we realize and so far as we realize it; our willing is the condition of its existence. Both our ideals and our character are created by us. Monotheism is not the inevitable and exclusive postulate of religion, but so far as this hypothesis works satisfactorily, it may be held as true. Thus is indicated a place for the "will to believe." The Absolute if accepted at all must be conceived not as static and changeless perfection, but as functional, with infinite potentialities of change, real not beyond but in experience. Pluralism as an interpretation of the universe may not be excluded. If there is anything personal at the heart of things, our bearing toward it will naturally condition its effect upon us. To act as if there were a God may therefore be the sole path to the knowledge and realization of God in the consciousness. The future life may likewise be conditioned on our behavior toward it as a possibility. At the very least meliorism may be the creed and endeavor of the individual. The relation of pragmatism to the movement introduced by Kant (q.v.) is not to be overlooked.

C. A. BECKWITH.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: W. James, *Pragmatism: a new Name for some old Ways of Thinking*, London and New York, 1907; idem, in *Philosophical Review*, xvii (1908), 1–17; F. C. S. Schiller, *Humanism*, New York, 1903; idem, *Studies in Humanism*, ib. 1907; H. H. Bawden, *The Principles of Pragmatism*, ib. 1910; E. W. Lyman, *Theology and Human Problems; a comparative Study of absolute Idealism and Pragmatism as Interpreters of Religion*, ib. 1910. For list of the numerous magazine and review articles on the subject the reader should consult W. I. Fletcher's *Annual Library Index*, New York.

PRAGUE, ARCHBISHOPRIC OF: The city of Prague, situated in the central part of Bohemia, was founded in the eighth century near the site of the ancient ducal castle; and first gained a position of importance in history with the establishment of Christianity in the interior of Bohemia. The Christianization of this was accomplished in connection with that of Moravia under the Eastern missionary brothers Cyril and Methodius (see CYRIL AND METHODIUS), but after Bohemia had withdrawn from the Moravian kingdom and placed itself under German protection Bohemia became a part of the diocese of Regensburg in 895. Boleslaw II., the Pious, sent his sister Milada to the pope to appeal for the establishment of a separate bishopric, and

in 971 this was granted by John XIII. Half a century earlier Duke Wenzel had erected the Church of St. Veit, and this, as the church of the martyrs St. Veit and St. Wenzel, the pope designated as the cathedral. However, the step was opposed by the bishop of Regensburg and his chapter and not until 973, upon a compact with the Emperor Otto I., was the bishopric of Prague established. The act of creation was ratified by Benedict VI. and the emperor, and the new bishopric was attached to the archdiocese of Mainz. The new diocese was an extensive one, embracing Bohemia, Moravia, Silesia, southern Poland, Galicia as far as Lemberg, and Slavic Hungary. The first bishop, proposed by the duke and unanimously chosen by the clergy and the people, was the Benedictine Dietmar (973–982); he was a Saxon who had lived in Bohemia for many years and was familiar with the Slavic language. His successor was Adalbert (see ADALBERT OF PRAGUE), the first native bishop, who introduced the Benedictine order and became the apostle of the Prussians, suffering martyrdom in 997. After 999 the erection of the dioceses of Cracow and Breslau diminished the area of that of Prague. In 1063 Moravia was separated. In 1212, after the elevation of the dukes to the kingship, the investiture of the bishop was conferred from the emperor upon the king of Bohemia. In 1344, through the efforts of Emperor Charles IV., Prague was made an archbishopric by Clement VI., and the bishopric of Olmütz and the recently formed bishopric of Leitomischl were subordinated to it. The first archbishop, Ernest of Pardubitz (1343–64), won great fame by his character and his wisdom and zeal in organization and administration. He proceeded to build the archcathedral and under him the university was founded in 1348. With the apostasy of Conrad and the rise of the Hussites the jurisdiction was inhibited and the foundations were destroyed and there followed a period (1431–1561) during which the archbishopric was in charge of administrators elected by the chapter. Emperor Ferdinand introduced the Jesuits to replace the orders whose foundations had been destroyed or taken, and for the privilege of naming the archbishop undertook the restoration of the despoiled archbishopric. With the " compacts " of the Council of Basel (1434) granting the use of the cup in the communion, a privilege not conceded until 1564 by Pope Pius IV., the return and ordination of the Utraquists (see HUSS, JOHN, HUSSITES, II., §§ 4–7) were provided, on the conditions later of accepting the articles of Trent; and thus under the legate of the council, Philibert (1433–39), who performed the episcopal functions, and his successors, and, with the restoration of Ferdinand I., under Archbishop Antonio Brus (1561–80), Martin Medek (1581–90), and Zbynek (1592–1606), progress was made in the rehabilitation of the archbishopric, the reestablishment of a Roman Catholic clergy, and the return of the orders, so that by 1603 the laws of Trent were publicly proclaimed at a provincial synod and Zbynek resumed the rank of a prince of the realm. Ferdinand ordered a restoration of Roman Catholicism under penalty of confiscation of land property and by military coercion, the result of which was that Protestantism was stamped out. Adalbert now reorganized the archdiocese and established the bishopric of Leitmeritz in 1655 and of Königgrätz in 1664. In 1777 Olmütz was made an archbishopric, in 1785 the new bishopric of Budweis was withdrawn and the bishoprics of Leitmeritz and Königgrätz were enlarged, so that the archbishopric of Prague was reduced to one-third of its former extent. At present the ecclesiastical province is composed of the archdiocese of Prague and the suffragan bishoprics of Leitmeritz, Königgrätz, and Budweis. Leitomischl became extinct after 1474.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sources are: *Regesta . Bohemiæ et Moraviæ*, ed. K. J. Erben and J. Emler, 5 parts, Prague, 1855–92; G. Dobner, *Monumenta historica Boemiæ*, 6 vols., Prague, 1764–85; *Scriptores rerum Bohemicarum*, ed. F. M. Pelzel, J. Dobrowsky, and F. Palacky, 3 vols., Prague, 1783–1829; *Fontes rerum Bohemicarum*, 5 vols., Prague, 1873–82. Consult: C. A. Pescheck, *Geschichte der Gegenreformation in Böhmen*, 2 vols., Dresden, 1844; W. W. Tomek, *Geschichte der Stadt Prag*, Prague, 1856; C. Eckhardt, *Geschichte der deutschen evangelischen Gemeinde in Prag*, Prague, 1891; J. Neuwirth, *Prag*, Leipsic, 1901; F. Lützow, *The Story of Prague*, London, 1902; S. Binder, *Die Hegemonie der Prager im Husitenkriege*, Prague, 1903; *KL*, x. 280–303.

PRAGUE, COMPACTATA OF: FOUR ARTICLES OF. See HUSS, JOHN, HUSSITES.

PRARTHANA SAMAJ OF BOMBAY. See INDIA, III., 2.

PRATT, WALDO SELDEN: Congregational layman; b. at Philadelphia Nov. 10, 1857. He was educated at Williams College (A.B., 1878) and Johns Hopkins University (1878–80). He was assistant director of the Metropolitan Museum of Art (1880–82), and since 1882 has been professor of music and hymnology at Hartford Theological Seminary, where he was also registrar in 1888–95. He was instructor in elocution in Trinity College, Hartford, in 1891–1905, and has been lecturer in musical history and science at Smith College since 1895 and at Mount Holyoke College in 1896–99, while since 1905 he has held a similar position at the Institute of Musical Art, New York City. From 1882 to 1891 he was organist of Asylum Hill Congregational Church, Hartford, and conductor of the Hosmer Hall Choral Union in the same city, and in 1884–1888 he was conductor of the St. Cecilia Club. He has written *Musical Ministries in the Church* (Chicago, 1901) and edited *St. Nicholas Songs* (New York, 1885) and *Songs of Worship* (1887), besides being musical editor of *Aids to Common Worship* (New York, 1887) and of the *Century Dictionary*.

PRAXEAS. See MONARCHIANISM, V., 2.

PRAYER.

I. In the Old Testament.
II. In the New Testament.
Source and Characteristics (§ 1).
James and Paul (§ 2).
Christocentric (§ 3).
III. In the Church.
Definition (§ 1).
The Element of Experience (§ 2).
Self-seeking Excluded (§ 3).
Modern Difficulties (§ 4).
Solution (§ 5).

I. In the Old Testament: The Old Testament places prayer in connection with other religious acts, such as sacrifices, vows, fasts, and mourning ceremonies. " To pray " is expressed in Hebrew by *'athar* or *he'ethir*, a verb which in Arabic means

" to sacrifice," and thus had a cultic meaning from the beginning. This word is found in the older sources of the Pentateuch and in Judges xiii. 8; Job xxii. 27, xxxiii. 26. More frequently *hithpallel* is used, from a root *palal* to which Wellhausen, with reference to I Kings xviii. 28, assigns the original meaning " to make incisions." Like the corresponding noun *tephillah*, it is found in older and later books of the Old Testament.

The Old Testament prescribes no such external ceremonies or postures in prayer as occur among the later Jews and the Mohammedans. The petitioner stood or prostrated himself as did the subject before the king. The hands were extended to express purity, and were lifted up to heaven or toward the sanctuary in intercession. Prayer as the freest expression of religious life could be performed in any place, although the sanctuary was considered the most appropriate. In early times prayer accompanied the offer of sacrifice; later it is mentioned expressly as an integral part of daily service, partly as a function of the Levites in which the people joined.

It is nowhere directed in the Old Testament because it was regarded as the natural expression of religious life. No definite form is prescribed; the mode of expression was left to the inspiration of the moment; but the prayers contained in the Psalter naturally gained lasting importance as hymns of the congregation. Prayer was called forth by the most varying sentiments; it was an expression of gratitude for gifts, but more frequently it expressed supplication for external well-being, for deliverance from distress, for forgiveness of sins, or for wisdom. It had reference at times to the salvation of the whole people, at other times to purely personal relations. Great importance was attached to the prayer of a prophet if it had reference to the fulfilment of the divine word and the manifestations of the true God. In this respect, Jeremiah was the great example and was imitated by the psalmists; for the Psalms are mostly entreaties for a decisive self-manifestation of God. There occurs frequently in the Old Testament also the intercessory prayer of men who stood in nearer relation to God and were especially heard. It was only in post-Exilic times that prayer was regarded as a meritorious service and practise, a conception which further developed under Pharisaism (see PHARISEES AND SADDUCEES). (F BUHL.)

II. In the New Testament: The reader of the New Testament, in the course of a rapid reading, might receive a very strong impression that as compared with other sacred books, including the Old Testament, there is an almost complete absence of the sacerdotal and sacrificial elements. The main cause is the revival of prophetism, begun by John the Baptist, embodied in Christ and giving distinctive quality to the Christianity of the Apostolic Age. A secondary cause is found in the history of Judaism. The bankruptcy of the Jewish state, the development of the Jewish Church, the shifting of the center of gravity from the nation to the individual, the irresistible though unconscious forces whereby the synagogal system ousted the Temple from the center of consciousness, —it was along this road that prayer came to take the place of sacrifice. The immense outflow of spiritual power and moral energy that founded the Christian Church made prayer its spring and soul. Necessarily Christian prayer was strongly corporate. Such was the tendency in Jewish prayer. Even stronger was the tendency in Christian prayer. And this because of the psychology of prayer. For prayer is yearning and desire fed on hope and grounded in faith. The reason for the Apostolic Church's existence was her belief in the kingdom of God. The power that grouped chosen individuals together and built them into congregational units was an impassioned confidence in the reality and immanence of that divine order. Consequently, prayer was the soul of the Christian community, and this prayer, by its constitution, was intensely corporate. The Lord's Prayer clearly shows this. Jesus put it forth not to serve as a specific prayer but to manifest the perspective and the proportion of prayer. It gives the framework and the constitution of prayer as Christians learned it from their master. The heart of it is a profound sense of solidarity between the followers of Jesus. Its fundamental quality is a corporate desire and will bent upon the kingdom of God.

1. Source and Characteristics.

Healing in the Apostolic Church was inseparable from prayer. The only deliberate testimony on this point is found in the epistle of James (v. 14–15). But the necessity of the connection is everywhere taken for granted. The personal practise of the Savior is clear. The incidental allusions of the New Testament are conclusive. There is no present need of arguing for the healing value of prayer when prayer, rightly framed, has control of consciousness both personal and corporate. Its therapeutic power can not be doubted; the question is how to use it wisely. The deep consciousness of salvation that pervades the New Testament makes joy the keynote of prayer as of life. In Paul, the supreme individual of the Apostolic Age, and at the same time its master-worker, this is strikingly true. Prayer is the atmosphere of life. It should be unceasing (I Thess. v. 17). It is the voice of the creative spirit in the soul of redeemed people (Rom. viii. 15). And because it is the deepest reach of experience, it is the final mystery. The redeemed man learns that his prayers by themselves are incompetent (Rom. viii. 26–27), but within the spirit of prayer in his breast he finds the Holy Spirit yearning. It is this discovery that gives him indestructible confidence.

2. James and Paul.

The nature of prayer in the New Testament accounts for and explains the relation of prayer to the person of Christ. The fact that prayer is essentially corporate being clearly in mind, it follows forthwith that prayer must be in the name of the Savior. The new community was inseparable from its founder and head. Baptism, the rite of entrance into Christian fellowship, was in his name (Acts ii. 38). The working creed was the conviction that he was master of the world's fortunes, this conviction taking the form of an impassioned be-

3. Christocentric.

lief in his speedy second coming. The deepening thought of the Church was Christologic (e.g., II Cor., as a model of pastoral theology). The miracles of healing were wrought in his name (Acts iii. 6). His name was taken to be the only name given under heaven among men whereby they must be saved (Acts iv. 12). Hence the person of Christ becomes inseparable from the idea of God (John xiv. 9). Consequently prayer is necessarily related to Christ. In Paul this is particularly clear. The mystical immanence of the risen Savior is the center of the inner life (Gal. ii. 20); all things which it becomes a Christian to do must be done in his name (Col. iii. 17). Therefore it follows that thanksgiving and prayer, the upgoing and outgoing of the soul to the source of life, while it goes direct to God, may, without detriment to the vital strength of monotheism, pass through the mind and person of Christ. In the ripest form of New-Testament thought, the Johannine theology, this becomes even clearer than in Paul. The mature Christian is to ask all things of God in his son's name (John xv. 16, xvi. 23).

The necessary recasting of trinitarian doctrine in the light of historical knowledge of the New Testament, the more vital pressure of the divine unity upon Christian consciousness brought about by the social problem, the deepening sense of the divine immanence—these forces in course of time will enable Christians to put aside those imperfect conceptions of the mediatorhood of Christ which led the Church to underweigh the humanity of the Savior. While praying to Jesus they will not forget that Jesus prayed. HENRY S. NASH.

III. In the Church: Prayer purports to be communication with God. Friends as well as opponents of prayer regard it as an attempt to gain in time of need the aid of a power supramundane.

1. Definition. On this ground prayer might be defended as an expression of human impotence. Prayer in its essence, however, is quite other than a cry of distress to an indefinite power or object; it is communion with God. Necessity is a stimulus to prayer, but the capacity for real prayer does not originate in need.

Prayer, as an address to God, implies that God is near to man, it involves certainty of the reality of God. One who had received no revelation of God would not be able to pray, while con-

2. The Element of Experience. sciousness of such an experience brings ability to pray aright and inspires devotion. Such devotion expands spiritual power, and at the same time continues the experience through which is realized consciousness of God's interposition in life. Absorption in such consciousness affords confidence that God is present to us. None can pray if by his own fault the recollection that God once called him is obscured. However urgently Jesus enjoined prayer, he surely did not believe that man should pray without regard to his present condition; he did not desire prayer in which the heart is removed from God. Each individual must feel the revelation of God to be his personal experience. God is found in that life in which he reveals himself as personal life in Jesus Christ, so that in addressing him man addresses the Father. The ability to commune with God is for man an introduction into a new reality and a foreglimpse of an infinite future. Nothing can give deeper joy than these drafts of breath in a new life. Consequently Luther asserted correctly that the Lord's Prayer, and indeed every right Christian prayer, begins with thanksgiving and praise. But after the address to God has unfolded as an invocation of the Father in heaven, prayer becomes necessarily an entreaty. With the Christian supplication originates in God's revelation of himself. To possess God means to seek God. He who does not find the desire for God repressing every other desire has not found the God who reveals himself in Christ. This desire should be the starting-point of the Christian's unceasing prayer. This thought is expressed in the opening petitions of the Lord's Prayer. They are not a declaration that the Christian wishes to consider God's affairs more important than his own; they express rather the most urgent concern of the Christian himself. Those men are not children of God who do not desire above all to be near the Father; and for this knowledge of God is necessary.

While Jesus directed to urgent and trustful prayer, without reservation and limitation, his directions presupposed that independence which was to grow up under his influence; they imply a disposition consciously ready to utter such petitions.

3. Self-Seeking Excluded. They might be interpreted as though God would grant every self-indulgent and selfish wish of his children. Indeed, they must be so understood if followed by one who knows no desire for God. One whose heart is filled with earthly care can utter only this in his prayer. Such a man, therefore, dares not pray as others pray, but is intent upon his own needs. This was doubtless the meaning of Jesus. He must have hated supremely insincere prayer. But is that prayer sincere which expresses only burning desire for some worldly concern under the idea, upheld by an energetic will, that a power exists which by continual supplication may be moved to grant some definite petition? It is evident that such a prayer is only seeming; for while the petitioner pretends to address God, his representation of God is only an amplification of his wish. That prayer is not real in which effort is needed to follow the words of Jesus in which he limits the confidence of supplication. One not in the proper inner condition can not understand how a man can pray in earnest realizing that the Father in heaven knows and considers his needs without his asking or expressing with his supplication the willingness to renounce it. He who takes these words of Jesus as precepts that may be followed, is left without a motive; he can not realize that they are the expression of experiences gained in the exercise of prayer. All these difficulties disappear for those to whom Jesus spoke these words. If the eye has been opened to the fact that the efficient cause in all reality is a personal life that surrounds man with fatherly love, longing for God results. This longing is real life, and to develop it is the one inexhaustible task. Only when God is known from personal experience will it be possible to discern

the relation of other forms of prayer. It can then be understood how a petition for external things, permeated by full assurance of being heard, may harmonize with a willingness to renounce it.

In modern times the question has been raised whether God for the sake of prayer causes to occur what otherwise would not have come to pass. In the last three centuries a clearer consciousness of the demonstrable reality in which men exist has severely shaken faith in the possibility of such a prayer receiving its answer. The two men who in the nineteenth century in their sermons represented Christian life in its fullest content,

4. Modern Difficulties.

Schleiermacher and F. W. Robertson (qq.v.), always clung to the belief that reality was conditioned by the laws of nature, and that the course of the world could not be changed simply because a man was not resigned to his lot. What they say concerning the possibility of answer to prayer shows how difficult it has become for Christian faith to hold its own in the spiritual conditions produced by the progress of science. If it is held that prayer might change the petitioner while all else continues its course, the energy of faith in prayer must necessarily be paralyzed. Faith has the power to elevate to a higher stage of life only when it develops the confidence that communication with the God of the other world is a power over against that reality which is to be experienced. If a personal life which has revealed itself has brought about a trust and confidence that it possesses power over all, there has been produced a personal conviction of a reality distinct from nature. Expectation is raised of finding an entrance to this reality. Access is had to it in a moral activity and a spirit of prayer which seeks God himself. But this very idea in which the life of faith progresses, the conception that God opens to those who knock, is destroyed if it is considered impossible for God to grant a prayer that will change a situation in order to remove a barrier between man and God; in that case God is no more the personal spirit who answers, but the unchangeable power of order. Many believe that God shows himself as personal life only in the inner development while the course of life is the unchangeable result of natural law. But it is not right to place psychical events in such contrast with nature, and that result of prayer which is limited to the inner life will not appear as a work of God through which he answers supplication, but as the direct effect of prayer in connection with inner conditions.

The conception of nature will always be able to shake confidence in that petition which is a mere expression of human desires; but it can have no power over prayer which is the outgrowth of personal acquaintance with God and of longing for him. For in such prayer there is always room

5. Solution.

for the thought of cause and effect in empirical nature. It must be emphasized that this thought does not represent the whole reality, but only that part of it grasped by the senses. Moreover, nature, as unlimited in space and time, is the creation of a God whose reality can not be proved but is experienced by those to whom he reveals himself. It need not be proved that he who stands on such a basis can believe in answer to prayer, and that in full recognition of the conception of nature. Such faith is possible since man, on the basis of the revelation which he has personally experienced, may be convinced that God is inclined toward him in fatherly love; for then he must say to himself that the environment in which he exists is for him a stepping-stone to a more intimate union with God, whom yet it lies within his power to deny. Then the thought becomes possible for him that events in the world of sense may happen in virtue of his supplication, as God's answer of his prayer. In this confidence disturbance need not follow the recollection of the limitless conditionality of all empirical events, since that points rather to the fact that God as the Almighty performs each of his miracles through the world which for him is a totality while to man it is a limitless entity. Science can therefore not restrain from prayer. Man can pray when the God of heaven has revealed himself in individual experience. He really prays who addresses God in order to come nearer to him. To this real prayer, in which is expressed the tendency of all moral striving, God has given the power to shape the future for man and the world. The prayer of power is never the desire to accomplish material changes, but is a longing after God. If such longing is sincere, supplications concerning earthly matters will always be interwoven with it; for the more man becomes self-conscious in the thought of God, the more evident will it be that many cares so claim him that he feels momentarily separated from God.

(W. Herrmann.)

Bibliography: On prayer in the Bible consult: C. A. Goodrich, *Bible History of Prayer*, Andover, 1861; P. Watters, *The Prayers of the Bible*, New York, 1883; P. Christ, *Die Lehre vom Gebet nach dem Neuen Testament*, Leyden, 1886; R. Smend, *Lehrbuch der alttestamentliche Religionsgeschichte*, p. 351, Freiburg, 1893; A. Juncker, *Das Gebet bei Paulus*, Berlin, 1905; J. E. McFadyen, *The Prayers of the Bible*, London, 1906; M. Kegel, *Das Gebet im Alten Testament*, Gütersloh, 1908; Nowack, *Archäologie*, pp. ii., 259 sqq.; Benzinger, *Archäologie*, pp. 386 sqq.; *DB*, iv. 38–45; *EB*, iii. 3823–32; *DCG*, ii. 390–393; *JE*, x. 164–171.

On prayer in the Church consult: S. I. Prime, *The Power of Prayer Illustrated . . at the Fulton Street . Meetings*, New York, 1873; J. F. Clarke, *The Christian Doctrine of Prayer*, Boston, 1874; I. S. Hartley, *Prayer and its Relation to Modern Thought and Criticism*, New York, 1875; *The Prayer-Gauge Debate*, by Prof. Tyndal, Francis Galton, and others against Dr. Littledale, President McCosh, . , Boston, 1876; H. R. Reynolds, *The Philosophy of Prayer*, London, 1881; H. L. Hastings, *Ebenezer; or, Records of prevailing Prayer*, London, 1882; J. C. Ryle, *Thoughts on Prayer*, London, 1886; D. W. Faunce, *Prayer as a Theory and as a Fact*, New York, 1890; H. C. G. Moule, *Secret Prayer*, London, 1890; R. Leroy, *La Prière chrétienne*, Lausanne, 1894; A. Murray, *The Ministry of Intercession; a Plea for more Prayer*, London, 1898; F. Cabrol, *Le Livre de la prière antique*, Paris, 1900; P. L. P. Guéranger, *The Spiritual Life and Prayer according to Holy Scriptures and Monastic Tradition*, London, 1900; R. A. Torrey, *How to Pray*, London, 1900; A. F. Douglas, *Prayer. A practical Treatise*, Edinburgh, 1901; E. F. von der Golst, *Das Gebet der ältesten Christenheit*, Leipsic, 1901 (comprehensive; contains a collection of early Christian prayers); W. H. M. H. Aitken, *The Divine Ordinance of Prayer*, London, 1902; A. W. Robinson, *Prayer in Relation to the Idea of Law*, in H. B. Swete, *Essays on Some Theological Questions*, London, 1905; M. P Talling, *Extempore Prayer*, Manchester, 1905; W. E. Biederwolf, *How can God answer Prayer . . the Nature, Conditions and Difficulties of Prayer*, Chicago, 1907; F. R. M. Hitchcock, *The Present Controversy in*

Prayer, London, 1909; Ann Louise Strong, *The Psychology of Prayer*, Chicago, 1909; Dora Greenwell and P. T. Forsyth, *The Power of Prayer*, London, 1910; W. A. Cornaby, *Let us Pray! Home Circle Papers on the Science and Art of Supplication*, ib. 1910; Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire*, fascs. xxxii. 663–xxxiii.

Among anthologies may be named: C. H. von Bogatzky, *Golden Treasury of Prayer* (a classic, latest ed., London, 1904); C. Wolfsgruber, *Hortutus animæ*, Augsburg, 1884; J. F. France, *Preces veterum ex operibus sanctorum excerptæ*, London, 1887; E. Hodder, *A Book of Uncommon Prayers*, London, 1898; M. W. Tilleston, *Great Souls at Prayer; fourteen Centuries of Prayer*, London, 1898; Annie de Pène, *Les Belles Prières*, Paris, 1909 (anthology of prayers from Christian, Moslem, Jewish, Buddhist, Hindu, and Shinto sources).

PRAYER BOOK, ENGLISH. See Common Prayer, Book of.

PRAYER FOR THE DEAD: A custom which, springing from natural and laudable affection, is found among very diverse peoples. It has a connection, in thought at least and often in fact, with that variety of sacrifice called vicarious, in which intercession is believed to be potential for the release of another from the consequences of that other's misdeeds. Its existence among the Jews in the second century before Christ is proved by II Macc. xii. 43–45, in which passage it is stated that not only prayer but sacrifice for the dead was offered by Judas, and the manner of statement shows that the deed was not unusual and was reckoned praiseworthy. But no Old-Testament passage can be quoted in favor of the custom.

There can be little question that from Judaism the practise passed over to the Christian Church. Attempts have been made to justify the custom by reference to the teaching of Jesus in such passages as Matt. xii. 32, but such inferences are regarded as strained. A more secure scriptural basis is afforded by the famous passage I Pet. iii. 19-20, cf. iv. 6, which is, however, sometimes brought into a forced connection with Zach. ix. 11. Combined with the vogue given by Jewish custom and the affection and hope which reached beyond the grave, this passage gave sanction to the practise in the early Christian Church. Tertullian is the earliest Christian writer who makes reference to prayers for the dead as customary (*De exhortatione castitatis*, xi.; *De anima*, lviii.; *De monogamia*, x.; *De corona*, iii.; Eng. transls. in *ANF*, vols. iii.–iv.). Similar testimony is given by Arnobius (*Adv. gentes*, iv. 36), Cyprian (*Ep.* i. of Oxford ed., lxv. in *ANF*, v. 367), Cyril of Jerusalem (*Mystagogikai catecheseis*, v. § 7), Augustine ("City of God," xxi. 13; *De cura pro mortuis*, i. and iv.), Chrysostom (Commentary on Phil., hom. 3), Dionysius the Areopagite (*Hierarchia ecclesiastica*, last chap.), and Apostolic Constitutions, VIII., ii. 12, iv. 41 (where the liturgical form is given). By some of these Fathers the custom was regarded as of apostolic institution. That the practise was strengthened by the idea of the solidarity of the Church as including the living and the dead is not unlikely, and a lingering influence of the classical Hades (q.v.) as a sort of middle state may have had its influence. The general practise of the early Church is further evinced by mortuary inscriptions. In view of all this it is not surprising that the prayer for the dead entered the liturgies, appearing in those of St. Mark, St. James, the Nestorian, Ambrosian, and Gregorian, and the Gallican. The development of the doctrine of Purgatory (q.v.), which in order of time followed the custom, fixed more firmly, if possible, the custom, and there developed in the West the Office (or Mass) for the Dead and the *Missa de sanctis*, the former at least as early as the sixth century. The offering of these prayers was from the earliest times particularly connected with the Eucharist. At the Reformation the practise fell into disrepute among Protestants, largely on the initiative of Calvin, and practically the entire Protestant Church rejects the custom. The Book of Common Prayer retains traces of the practise, which has not been expressly prohibited in the Anglican Church, and is indeed followed in certain parts.

Geo. W Gilmore.

Bibliography: *Hierurgia Anglicana*, pp. 320–324, London, 1848 (gives examples of mortuary inscriptions containing prayers for the dead); J. H. Blunt, *Dictionary of Doctrinal and Historical Theology*, pp. 585–586, ib. 1870; F. G. Lee, *The Christian Doctrine of Prayer for the Departed*, ib. 1875; H. M. Luckock, *After Death*, ib. 1881; E. H. Plumptre, *Spirits in Prison*, New York, 1885; A. J. Anderson, *Is it Right to Pray for the Dead?* London, 1889; H. T. D., *The Faithful Dead. Shall we pray for them?* ib. 1896; E. T. d'E. Jesse, *Prayers for the Departed*, ib. 1900; C. H. H. Wright, *The Intermediate State and Prayers for the Dead*, ib. 1900; H. Falloon, *The Blessed Dead: do they need our Prayers?* ib. 1905; D. Stone, *The Invocation o Saints*, new ed., ib. 1910 (favors the practise); *DCA*, i. 267–274, ii. 1202–03, 1437–38.

PRAYER-GAGE DEBATE, THE: A controversy evoked by an unsigned communication by Prof. John Tyndall in the *Contemporary Review*, July, 1872 ("The 'Prayer for the Sick.' Hints toward a Serious Attempt to Estimate its Value," vol. xx. 205–210). The article proposed that "one single ward or hospital, under the care of first-rate physicians and surgeons, containing certain numbers of patients afflicted with diseases which have been best studied, and of which the mortality rates are the best known, whether the diseases are those which are treated by medical or surgical remedies, should be, during a period of not less, say, than three or five years, made the object of special prayers by the whole body of the faithful, and that, at the end of this time, the mortality rates should be compared with those of other leading hospitals, similarly well managed, during the same period. Granting that time is given and numbers are sufficiently large, so as to insure a minimum of error from accidental disturbing causes the experiment will be exhaustive and complete." This was replied to by Richard Frederick Littledale (ib., pp. 430–454) who, while acknowledging the probability that prayer belongs to a region of law which permits inquiry concerning its practical operations, objected to the scheme, that it was impracticable, and that we can not quantify prayer. Professor Tyndall (ib., pp. 763–766), in a rejoinder, asks for restoration of prayer to its rightful domain and for verification. The author of the proposal (ib., pp. 766–777) cites as reasons why his suggestion was not complied with, inadequate conceptions respecting prayer and God's relations with his creatures. The discussion was continued by James McCosh, William Knight, the duke of Argyll (ib., pp. 777–782, vol. XXI., pp. 183–198,

464–473), and Canon Liddon. Francis Galton ("Statistical Inquiry into the Efficacy of Prayer," *Fortnightly Review*, new series, vol. xii., 1872, pp. 125–135) drew attention to the longevity of sovereigns and clergymen, suggested inquiries concerning missionaries and comparison of the death rate at birth of children of praying and non-praying parents, and maintained that insurance companies take no account of prayer as an asset in assuming risks. The interest quickened by this proposal bore fruit in many sermons and in many articles in periodicals in Great Britain and America, some of which were gathered and published in *The Prayer Gauge Debate* (Boston, 1876). C. A. Beckwith.

Bibliography: The more important articles educed in the discussion are indexed under "Prayer," "Prayer Cure," and "Prayer Test" in *Poole's Index to Periodical Literature*, i. 2, pp. 1041–42, Boston, 1893. Note should be taken of John Tyndall's *Address Delivered before the British Association Assembled at Belfast*, London, 1874, New York, 1875, and of Mark Hopkins' *Prayer and the Prayer Gauge*, New York, 1874.

PRAYER, HOURS OF. See Breviary; Canonical Hours; Vesper.

PRAYER, WEEK OF. See Evangelical Alliance, § 3.

PREACHING FRIARS. See Dominic, Saint, and the Dominican Order.

PREACHING, HISTORY OF.

I. In the Early Church.
Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Preaching (§ 1).
The Period 200–300 A.D. (§ 2).
Greco-Syrian Preaching, 300–450 A.D. (§ 3).
Individual Preachers (§ 4).
Zeno, Ambrose, Augustine (§ 5).
The Greek Church, Continued (§ 6).
The Post-Augustinian Latin Church (§ 7).
II. In the Middle Ages.
1. To the Twelfth Century.
Characteristics of the Sermon (§ 1).
Individual Preachers (§ 2).
German and French Pulpit (§ 3).
2. Twelfth to the Fifteenth Century.
Influences Leading to Improvement (§ 1).
Characteristics of the Sermon (§ 2).
Preaching of the Mystics (§ 3).
Reformers Before the Reformation (§ 4).
3. Close of the Middle Ages.
Frequency and Worth of the Sermon (§ 1).
Individual Preachers (§ 2).
III. The Continental Pulpit in Modern Times.
1. The Period of the Reformation.
The Controlling Factors (§ 1).
Luther (§ 2).
His Sermons Characterized (§ 3).
Other Lutheran Reformers (§ 4).
Zwingli and the Early Reformed Preachers (§ 5).
The Roman Catholic Pulpit (§ 6).
2. Protestant Orthodox Pulpit, 1580–1700.
The New Scholasticism (§ 1).
Style and Content of the Sermon (§ 2).
Individual Names (§ 3).
The Reformed Pulpit (§ 4).
The Roman Catholic Pulpit (§ 5).
3. Transformation of the Protestant Pulpit, 1700–1810.
Pietism (§ 1).
Spener and His Followers (§ 2).
Various Schools (§ 3).
The Moravian Pulpit (§ 4).
4. Reform of the German Pulpit and the Preaching of Rationalism.
The Conflicting Influences (§ 1).
Mosheim and His School (§ 2).
Entrance of Rationalism (§ 3).
The Reaction (§ 4).
The Mediating Pulpit (§ 5).
Preaching Outside Germany (§ 6).
5. The Evangelical Pulpit of the Nineteenth Century.
Basal Influences (§ 1).
Schleiermacher (§ 2).
His School (§ 3).
Reminders of Rationalism (§ 4).
A New Trend (§ 5).
The Confessional Type (§ 6).
Emphasis on the Practical (§ 7).
Pietistic Antirationalistic Preaching (§ 8).
Individualism Dominant (§ 9).
Modernistic Group (§ 10).
6. The Recent German Pulpit.
Emphasis on the Practical (§ 1).
A Composite Group (§ 2).
7. The Continental Pulpit Outside Germany.
In Scandinavia (§ 1).
The German-Swiss Pulpit (§ 2).
In France and Holland (§ 3).
8. The Roman Catholic Pulpit.
Early Characteristics (§ 1).
Later Tendencies (§ 2).
IV. Preaching in the English Tongue.
1. Before the Reformation.
The Anglo-Saxon Period (§ 1).
The Norman Period (§ 2).
The Pre-Reformation Period (§ 3).
2. The Reformation.
General Account (§ 1).
English Preachers (§ 2).
The Scotch Preachers (§ 3).
3. The Seventeenth Century.
Character of Preaching (§ 1).
Leading Preachers (§ 2).
4. The Eighteenth Century in the British Islands.
Survey (§ 1).
Leading Preachers (§ 2).
5. The Eighteenth Century in North America.
6. The Nineteenth Century in the British Islands.
The First Third of the Century, 1801–1833 (§ 1).
Middle of the Century, 1833–1869 (§ 2).
Close of the Century, 1869–1900 (§ 3).
7. The Nineteenth Century in Greater Britain.
8. The Nineteenth Century in the United States.
Before the Civil War (§ 1).
The Civil War and After (§ 2).
9. Twentieth-Century Outlook.

I. In the Early Church: It has occurred not infrequently that those who would give a history of preaching point to the apostolic letters in the New Testament as examples of apostolic homiletics. While these epistles undoubtedly give the form in which the apostles set forth the foundations of Christian faith, it can not be too strongly emphasized that they are not sermons. The epistolary style governs throughout. This position must be maintained in spite of the newest hypothesis advanced by Wrede and others to the effect that, particularly in the epistle to the Hebrews, and also in other New-Testament writings original addresses to Christian congregations are to be suspected. While this hypothesis has much in its favor, the proof of the existence of oral discourses therein has not been conclusively advanced. While, then, this idea has largely been given up, the more strongly do expounders of the history of preaching rest upon the discourses of Peter and Paul as reported in the Acts of the Apostles. Yet here difficulties arise, some maintaining that the speeches there reported are to a greater or less degree the product of the author of that book, while others decide that they are a working over of the actual discourses. Even conservative critics, however, agree with the others that the discourses were not exactly taken from the mouth of the speaker and are not exact reproductions of the speeches actually delivered, related as they are in style to other parts of the same book. On the other hand it is to be noted that the discourses have the character of sermons in that they have a direct relation to the concrete situation in

1. Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Preaching.

which they are given. Peter's discourses in Acts ii. 14 sqq., and iii. 12 sqq., deal with Pentecost and the healing of the lame man, while that in x. 34 sqq. is controlled by the vision of the context regarding clean and unclean. Paul's discourse in xiii. 16 sqq. has the character of a missionary address, the speech at Athens is exactly suited to a disputatious body of philosophers; but the address reported in xx. 17 sqq. is almost entirely personal, and is therefore not strictly a sermon. In all these examples, whatever partakes of the general character of the sermon is missionary in type. At any rate, these discourses afford little or nothing bearing on the history of preaching. Yet they may suggest the direction which preaching took in those times in the conflict with heathenism, the use of resources supplied by heathenism itself, the exposition of what had come through Christ, and the appeal to the ethical consciousness of the hearer. Acts ii. 42–43 indicates further the practise of the apostles in giving instruction to the community (cf. I Cor. xii.–xiv.; Rom. xii. 6–8; I Pet. iv. 10); but neither rules nor settled custom limited the brotherly communications. If a general term be needed to apply to the religious speeches of that period, it can take only the form of "free brotherly utterance." For the post-apostolic period the testimony of Justin Martyr is of special value (*I Apol.* lxvii.; Eng. transl., *ANF*, i. 186), showing the reading of Scripture and exhortation of a practical character based on the passage read. Tertullian (*Apol.* xxxix; Eng. transl., *ANF*, ii. 46) further illustrates the character of the discourses of that period (cf. *De animo*, ix.; *ANF*, iii. 188) when he says: "With the sacred words we nourish our faith, animate our hope, make our confidence more steadfast, and by inculcations of God's precepts confirm good habits." The one sermon from those times, the so-called II Epistle of Clement, is practical in character: it shows the reading of Scripture, the address only loosely connected therewith, read not spoken (chap. xix.), inculcating service of Christ with works and not with the mouth, and urging to repentance and charity and with pure heart to the service of God. A. Harnack has called attention (*Der Presbyter-Prediger des Irenæus*, in *Philotesia, Paul Kleinert gewidmet*, Berlin, 1907) to the fact that in the received remains of the literary work of Irenæus fragments from sermons of a "Presbyter-preacher" are extant which furnish examples of the earliest Christian exegetical-polemic homilies in existence.

Origen (q.v.), the great thinker and scholar of the Greek Church, is the father of the sermon as a fixed ecclesiastical custom, to whom can be traced the theological-practical exposition of a definite text as well as the homily. It is noteworthy that, at that period of the separation of divine service into a homiletical-didactic part and a mystical part, the sermon was missionary and apologetic in type and suited to instruct the catechumens. It took the form of explication and application of the text, using particularly the method of allegory, which from that time on became prevalent and controlled the homiletical use of Scripture until the Reformation. Origen in his preaching followed the passage verse by verse, expounding it grammatically and historically, but dwelt most upon the deeper mystical or allegorical meaning, but he never forgot that the true purpose of the sermon is to develop the moral sense. Equipped with fine memory, marvellous knowledge of Scripture, and great learning, he knew how to apply the little things spiritually, practically, and often in a broad and general sense. He usually closed with the doxology. His appeal was rather to the perception than to the will. Of further development of the sermon in the school of Origen little is known. The homilies ascribed to Gregory Thaumaturgus (q.v.) are probably of later origin and recall the style of the Persian sage Aphraates (q.v.). The celebration of saints' days influenced the homily through the practise of pronouncing panegyrics, and this goes back into the third century. From the West there are remains of the sermons of the schismatic Roman bishop, Hippolytus (q.v.), but these are too fragmentary to guide to a decision regarding his style of preaching, and the longer addresses ascribed to him are probably not genuine. The sermon thus ascribed, which is entitled "On the Holy Theophany" and deals with the baptism of Jesus (Matt. iii.), follows closely the scriptural basis, yet has not the form of the exegetical homily; it appears more like a vibrating, picturesque hymn, and is the transition from the simple homily to the artistic synthetic sermon to the congregation. Since the writing *Adversus aleatores*, ascribed by Harnack to the second century (see CYPRIAN, § 5), is probably of later date, examples of Latin eloquence are to be sought first in Tertullian. Yet even from him no samples of the sermon have come down, though his primitive, fresh, spiritual, granulous, and always sententious style long remained the pattern for the eloquence of the Latin Church. Cyprian took Tertullian as his model in the development of dialectical yet practical, warm, and piercing persuasiveness. Lactantius mentions the celebrity of Cyprian's sermons, of which none are certainly extant.

2. The Period 200-300 A. D.

With the victory of Christianity and the development of the service came a soaring of the sermon. Preaching became more frequent, being employed even during the week and during fast seasons in some places daily. As the Church during that period assimilated more and more Greco-Roman culture, the sermon developed *pari passu*. The most noted Christian preachers had not seldom been educated in the rhetorical schools of the heathen, and employed in their sermons the rules of rhetoric and the artistic effects taught there, and polish became almost an end, often giving more brilliancy than warmth. The hearers came to look for esthetic satisfaction rather than for edification, leaving after the sermon and before the Eucharist. Especially did the eulogy lead to a strained ostentation which showed no middle way between the purpose of the sermon and classical oratory. The homily retained its method of analytical explanation and application. The modern structural sermon had not yet been born. The sermon began with a rhetorical statement of the object and continued with salutation or invocation

3. Greco-Syrian Preaching 300-450 A. D.

of blessing. The different currents of the life of the Church are exhibited in the discourses. Alongside of the Alexandrian allegorical method was the Antiochian grammatical-historical plan; doctrinal controversy was reflected; as were the tendencies toward sacrificialism and ceremonialism and the increasing practise of veneration of the saints and of the Virgin and toward asceticism. Polemics were not absent. In the East the sermon was often imaginative, poetic, even bombastic and wordy; in the West the rhetoric was more sober, and the sermon practical, simple, and clear. The function came to be confined to the bishops and the presbyters, the deacon requiring the authorization of the bishop before he could officiate. The bishop preached sitting; the audience stood in North Africa but sat in Italy and the East. The sermon came in the first part of the service after singing and reading of Scripture; its length varied, and in the Greek Church all the audience did not always await the conclusion.

The Greco-Syrian sermon divides into the practical-rhetorical, the dogmatic-didactic, and the ascetic-mystical. Eusebius of Cæsarea (q.v.) forms the transition to this period, and already shows the style of the Byzantine court in a tendency to bombast and flattery after the pattern furnished in the Greek schools of rhetoric. But the leader in establishing the practical-rhetorical school of preaching was Basil the Great (q.v.), who gained his title by his preaching. He was bold, brilliant without aiming at brilliance, looking rather for force than elegance of diction, earnest, possessing a lively imagination, clearness, orderliness, and solidity of thought. All this made him, next to Chrysostom, the pattern of the Greek Church. Gregory of Nyssa (q.v.) stood near Basil in eminence in power of exposition and fluency, and excelled him as a thinker. His skill was less the product of nature than of art, and his turn of mind was speculative, philosophical, theological, with a strong trend to the allegorical. He was at his best in addresses commemorating persons of high estate, martyrs, and saints. Gregory Nazianzen possessed a solicitous soul with a tender spirit, in whom the wish for seclusion fought with the desire to use his splendid gifts for the community. A born orator of great versatility, he had, as compared with Basil, a feminine and receptive nature. His theological ideas were clear, his dialectic nimble, his imagination lively; his diction was elegant and his style deeply affected with irony often tempered with pathos, while he could flash out with invective. A defender of the doctrine of the Trinity and fond of dogmatic discussion, especially of the problems then alive in the Church, he did not lose sight of practical needs. His sermon followed a single thought and purpose, yet not without digressions. Greek preaching reached its eminence in the Antiochian school, which employed classical norms, alongside of exegetical, rhetorical, and popularly practical elements. Of this school Chrysostom (q.v.) was the chief exponent, combining in himself the exegete and the grammarian. Among those who employed the dogmatic-didactic style Eusebius of Emesa (q.v.) is probably to be numbered, though his homilies are lost. The same is to be said of Cyril of Jerusalem (q.v.). The homilies of Cyril of Alexandria (q.v.) have a dogmatic-polemic cast. The Antiochian Theodoret, bishop of Cyrrhus (q.v.), was peculiarly a homilist, as is shown in his ten addresses on divine providence, in which he preaches a sort of natural religion. Keen insight, orderly exposition, concise and luminous diction characterize his work. Examples of ascetic-mystical sermonizing come from the recluses of the desert. The twenty-nine addresses of the Egyptian monk Isaiah partake of the character of primitive Christianity, dealing partly with practical and common Christianity, in part with matter for the monks. Fifty homilies of the elder Macarius (see MACARIUS, 1) survive; they are textless, answer questions put by the monks, are full of noble pictures, deeply ethical, and emphasize the corruption of soul and body and the mystical union with Christ. Ephraem Syrus (q.v.), while belonging with this group, was eminently original. His was a native, not an acquired, homiletical genius, and his inspiration was a holy zeal for the orthodox faith and for the monastic ideal. Poetic brilliancy and the might of his exposition make of him one of the great preachers of the early Church. The swing of his thought is united with a metrical silveriness of diction, while the stream of his emotions combining with a fulness of imagination compel him to the use of exclamation, question, apostrophe, and other varieties of rhetorical expression. He is a mighty preacher of repentance.

4. Individual Preachers.

The sermon bloomed out near the end of this period in independent form through Augustine and Leo (q.v), who were long the best fruits of homiletic study in the West. During the fourth century the West did not simply imitate the East, it copied it. Bishop Zeno of Verona (q.v.) has left ninety-three genuine sermons or tracts. His best examples deal with patience, humility, modesty, covetousness, and he was largely dependent upon Basil. In strong contrast with these earlier preachers of the West stood Augustine (q.v.), who was distinguished for his energy and tirelessness as a preacher. The sermons of Augustine are strong in the elements of experience, witness-bearing, dialectic, and practical application; they are less affected by secular training and more infused with the Gospel; they give the impression of being by a man who had triumphed over the flesh, false philosophy, heathendom, and heresy, who spoke from the depths of his own living experience. They show the gifts of keen understanding, a power of deep speculation, precise expression, wide powers of illustration, and a deep sense of what salvation means. Augustine employs allegory less than the Greeks, stresses more the historical narratives of the Old Testament, and suppresses polemics more. His speeches show unity, coordination, and plan; the ethical elements are deeply Christian, the dialectic is keen, the antitheses are pregnant, and the thought is spiritual. His sermons on festal days, in rimed prose, deserve especial mention.

5. Zeno, Ambrose, Augustine.

In the Greek Church of the period from the fifth

century the decadence of preaching is visible in the excessive pomposity of verbiage in pulpit oratory, which concerned itself largely with the cultus of the saints and of Mary, with dogmatic hair-splitting, with asceticism, and with the value of works of piety. The development of the ritual in the brilliant unfolding of liturgy made the place of the sermon ever narrower and lessened its importance. After the great figures of the fourth century, Greek preaching seems to have exhausted itself, while to the people the sermon was purely secondary as compared with the liturgy. Its contents, dealing with legends of the saints, veneration of Mary, polemics against heresy, and with declamatory exposition of the cultus, justify this estimate. The three sermons of Proclus on the *theotokos* and twenty homilies on festal days are dogmatic-polemic in character. For Basil of Seleucia, Jacob of Sarug, and Andrew of Crete see the articles. Of the later sermonizing in the Greek Church little need be said. The genuineness of the sermons ascribed to John of Damascus (q.v.) is still under discussion. These exemplify the failings of the period—search of the Old Testament for types, allegorizing, mystical juggling with numbers, legendary handling of the Gospel history, and the like. A lesser star is Theodore the Studite (q.v.), whose 135 *Sermones paraenetici* are extempore addresses to monks, often containing fiery exhortations and well-rounded figures. His other sermons exhibit the taste of the times for the pompous and the superstitious. Where the sermon continues in the Greek Church, it occurs either before or after the mass. Of preachers of a later time may be noted Theophanes Kerameus, archbishop of Taormina (c. 1050), sixty-two homilies on the Gospel for the day, simple, popular, expository; Eustathius, archbishop of Thessalonica (c. 1194), who declaimed against hypocrisy, monkish love of ostentation, ascetic externalism, superstition, and frivolity; Germanus, patriarch of Constantinople (c. 1240); John Caleca (1330); Gregory Palamas, archbishop of Thessalonica; Gennadius II., of Constantinople (q.v.); and from the modern Russian Church Malow, archpriest in St. Petersburg, Philaretus, metropolitan in Moscow, and especially Innokenti, bishop of Charkow.

6. The Greek Church, Continued.

In the West the post-Augustinian sermon stood on a lower plane than that of Augustine himself. The chief sign of decadence is found in the lack of originality; Augustine remains the model, though adornment and elaboration have their part. The use of pericopes had its influence upon the sermon, which was employed to explain the Scripture selections. Preaching was also centered about the particular occasion and less bound to the text. For Gaudentius of Brescia, Peter Chrysologus, and Maximus of Turin see the articles. Leo I. (q.v.) is the first Roman bishop to leave behind Latin sermons (ninety-six on feast and fast days, etc.). While he is inferior to Augustine in fulness and depth of thought, he excels him in elegance, in piquant pregnancy of style, and in the rhythm of his sentences. While he employs sermons on festal occasions for dealing with the controversies of the period, he preaches no monkish morality, though there is little of exposition of Scripture in his preaching. It is greatly to the honor of Gregory the Great (q.v.) that he used the sermon to good effect and stimulated others; yet his sermons are best characterized by the word "practical." They are intelligible, simple, suited to the capacity of his hearers. Fulgentius of Ruspe in North Africa (q.v.) imitates in speech and method Augustine and Leo, employing antithesis and pregnant brevity without polish yet with success. Among the preachers of Gaul mention may be made of Hilary of Arles, and Faustus of Riez (qq.v.). Cæsarius of Arles (q.v.) is of high importance in the history of preaching. He did not disdain the application of the finest art, but to gain polish did not sacrifice contents. To enchain his hearers he used especially parable and dialogue, and was not altogether free from allegorizing. Yet through all there was the background of a strong religious personality, employing forceful ethical truths.

7. The Post-Augustinian Latin Church.

II. In the Middle Ages.—1. To the Twelfth Century: The Christianizing of the lands to which the Latin tongue was foreign furnished new occasion for the sermon of the Western Church. While the service was in Latin, the sermon required the use of the vernacular of the region. Irenæus at Lyons preached to the Celtic natives in their own language, though with the Latinizing of Gaul, the Latin sermon came in. So in Germany, Gallus knew the speech of the Allemanni, Boniface preached to the Frieslanders in their own tongue, and in Carolingian times there were directions so to preach that the people might understand. In spite of these facts, from the early part of the Middle Ages there are few remains of sermons in the vernacular, yet numerous works of the kind in Latin. But behind German vernacular lurked Latin conceptions and thinking. Before the clergy, Latin retained its rights. The sermons of this period show little originality; many of them were either translations or imitations of the homilies of the Fathers, especially of Augustine, Leo, or Gregory. The collections of sermons fostered this, e.g., the *Homiliarium* of Paul the Deacon (q.v.), and they became the resource of preachers, smothering independent work. The duty of preaching was principally assigned to the bishops; the priests in the rural parishes shared in this work, though but little of the product of the latter has survived (the period 900–1100 has been called "the period of the bishop's sermon"). The "rule" of Chrodegang (q.v.) required preaching once a fortnight at least; the Carolingian synods provided for preaching every Sunday and feast day. The sermon generally centered about the Gospel for the day, which it immediately followed; though sermons were also built on the Epistle. The extent of the sermons meant for the people is generally small; those meant for use in the cloisters were longer. The former show a fondness for legendary material, the latter are allegorical-mystical. The foregoing pictures the condition of things for a long period, though ecclesiastical fostering of the sermon is abundantly evident. Thus Bishop Theodolf of Orléans, in his

1. Character of the Sermon.

capitular of 797, may be quoted: "We exhort you (the priests) to be ready to teach the people; whoever knows the Scripture, let him preach Scripture; and whoever knows not Scripture, let him teach, at least, that which is surely known, so that the people may refuse the evil and do what is good, inquire after peace and follow it." In a capitular of 801 the same prelate ordered that: "the priests are to be urged on the Lord's Days, each in accord with his ability, to preach to the people." To like effect might be quoted the *Capitulare episcoporum* of 801, the Synod of Tours (canon 17; 813), the Council of Reims (canon 15; 813), the capitular of Charlemagne of the year 789 (chap. lxxxii. deals with "the preaching of bishops and presbyters"). This last goes further and prescribes the subjects to be dealt with in the sermon, covering the great topics of theological consideration and the Christian virtues.

From what has already been said it may be inferred that what has come down is not the actual sermon as delivered, but in part the preparatory notes or later reports written down, and in part collections of model sermons. Most noted of these is the *Homiliarium* of Paul the Deacon (q.v.; and see HOMILIARIUM). These collections make much use of patristic homiletic literature, few bearing the marks of individuality. Thus Rabanus Maurus (q.v.) used Cæsarius of Arles, though he impressed upon his collection a distinct moralizing characteristic. The personality of Haimo of Halberstadt (q.v.) is also recognizable in his collection; the homilies are longer and deal with geographical, historical, and exegetical questions, and stick closely to the text. There is a series of Latin sermons which, though ascribed to well-known men, are not surely genuine. Thus thirteen *Instructiones*, which appear to have been delivered before monks, go under the name of St. Columban (q.v.); a Latin sermon ascribed to Gallus, a pupil of Columban, belongs to a later date. If the homilies ascribed to St. Elegius (q.v.) be genuine, they show him to have been a man who aimed at the principal matters. The sermons ascribed to Boniface (q.v.) are not genuine. Similarly from the twelfth century collections of sermons have come down. Thus a homiletical help known as the *Speculum ecclesiæ*, which used to be ascribed to Honorius of Autun (q.v.) but probably came from the hermit Honorius, is of Latin origin, is practically identical with the *Defloratione*s of which Abbot Werner was the reputed author. It is of great significance for the history of preaching in Germany Another book of the kind is the so-called *Physiologus*, which goes back to Greek preaching, but brings legends of animals into allegorical connection with Christian verities. It appears in various forms, both Latin and German. Of Latin origin are the sermons of Abbot Gottfried of Admont, meant for instruction in the monastery, exegetical in character The twenty-nine homilies of the monk Boto are instructive, while the five sermons of Berengoz (q.v.) were intended for monks, and have at their basis a Biblical passage. The thirteen sermons of Eckbert of Schönau are controversial and directed against the Cathari (see NEW MANICHEANS, II.).

2. Individual Preachers.

The oldest remains of early German sermons are in manuscripts at Munich and Vienna dating from the eleventh century. These sermons are the result of the working over of deliverances of Augustine and Gregory. From the twelfth century a greater number of sermon collections have come down. The most important of these is that containing the sermons of the Priest Conrad. The absence of a name from most of these collections would lead one rightly to infer that they display little originality; and this dependence upon earlier work continues, for the later German collections use those which preceded them. In method these German sermons are not to be differentiated from the Latin. The Biblical passage is briefly explained at the beginning, then the passage is followed in the order of its verses, while allegory is employed and all sorts of meanings are discovered. Introduction, discussion, and exordium are all brief. The book of sermons of Conrad gives sufficient for a full year. For Sundays the epistle is first briefly discussed, and then the Gospel, somewhat more at length. For the festivals a number of selections are given, and a series of sermons on the saints completes the whole. Preachers among the bishops of this period who deserve mention are Solomon of Constance (d. 920), who often preached to the people; Archbishop Bruno of Cologne (q.v.); Conrad of Constance (d. 976); Wolfgang of Regensburg (d. 994); Archbishop Heribert of Cologne (998–1011), whose preaching is described by Rupert of Deutz; Archbishop Anno of Cologne (q.v.); Archbishop Bardo of Mainz (d. 1051), the Chrysostom of his times; Gotthard of Hildesheim (q.v.); and the preaching hermit Guenther. The German sermon of the period prior to 1200 exhibits a popular and practical character. The preaching in France of this period ran parallel with that in Germany. Homiliaria existed there as well as in Germany, and from the twelfth century there are rich remains in manuscript form. Maurice de Sully, archbishop of Paris (d. 1196), was greatly celebrated as a preacher.

3. German and French Pulpit.

2. Twelfth to the Fifteenth Century: A complete change came over the spirit of the sermon in the period from the twelfth to the fifteenth century. The development of theology in France, the influence of Scholasticism and Mysticism, of the crusades and the begging friars, reformatory movements, and the development of a higher culture gave a new impulse to preaching and in part a new content, and affected even the form in favor of a more artistic and finished product. In the sermon of the eleventh and twelfth centuries there were signs of betterment. Fulbert of Chartres (q.v.) exhibits the beginnings of scholastic preaching in a learned, dogmatic-polemic, allegorical, dialectic, and demonstrative style. The sermons of Peter Damian (q.v.) exhibit an extravagant bent for the cult of the Virgin, as do those of Bishop Amadeus of Lausanne (d. 1158); Anselm (q.v.) is not to be overlooked. Other preachers of note were Gottfried of Vendome, Hildebert of Tours, and Abelard (qq.v.). The beginnings of popular preaching appear in the predecessors of the begging

1. Influences Leading to Improvement.

monks, and a fresh, stirring spirit marks the age of the crusades as the champions mingle with the high and low and urge the freeing of the Holy Land. The monk Radulph preached the crusade and also hatred of the Jews; Norbert of Xante, archbishop of Magdeburg, was a second John the Baptist in his preaching of repentance, while in France were Robert of Arbrissel and Fulco of Neuilly (q.v.). The preaching of the mystics took deep hold of the people, especially that of Hugo of St. Victor, Bernhard of Clairvaux, the greatest preacher of his age, and Hildegard of Bingen. The Latin and German preaching of the scholastics reflects the characteristics of their philosophical discussions—definitions, distinctions, questions, arguments, and the like. The style varies, but a definite unity now begins to rule, whether the sermon is textual or thematic. Noted names are Cæsarius of Heisterbach and Anthony of Padua (qq.v). Albertus Magnus (q.v.) was known for his series of sermons on a single text (Prov. ix. 5), the first of the kind, while the sermons of his pupil Thomas Aquinas (q.v.) show a dry formalism and dialectic arrangement, as do those of Hugo of St. Cher (q.v.), and Petrus de Palude, patriarch of Jerusalem. German sermons scholastic in character were those of Nicholas of Landau (c. 1340), and Henry of Frimar (d. about 1340), of whose work little but skeleton appears. Jordan of Quedlinburg (middle of the fourteenth century) preached against the sects and against mysticism. Henry of Langenstein (q.v.), in his *Sermones de tempore per annum*, handles the Gospel pericopes in scholastic fashion. In this period belong the sermons wrongly ascribed to Albertus Magnus, which, while Evangelical and practical in interest, are yet scholastic in type.

The popular preaching of the begging friars in the thirteenth century was a reaction against the stiff dogmatism of scholasticism. The members of the orders were allowed to preach without special permission from the bishops, and the results were important, going as they did to the masses in a fresh, natural, concrete, and often dramatic style. While sometimes the addresses bordered on the grotesque, yet a deep and broad comprehension of the essentials of the Gospel was present, and the sermons were ethical in content and urged to repentance. Distinguished names are the Dominican John of Vicenza, the noted preacher of crusades and prosecutor of heretics Conrad of Marburg (q.v.), the Augustinian Eberhard (c. 1285), and especially the Franciscan Berthold of Regensburg (q.v.). In a strain not concordant with Berthold was the anonymous "Schwarzwald preacher," the author of a series of sermons preached to laymen and then collected as a homiletical volume. His sermons for Sundays give a Latin introduction, a German exordium which covers the entire Gospel for the day, discusses the theme in a popular, naive, and often striking manner, with incisive application and suggestion of the dogmatic in content. During the tenth and eleventh centuries there had been little ecclesiastical official concern about preaching. But a synod of Treves (1227) directed the clergy to instruct the people in faith and morals, forbade the ignorant to preach, but laid it as a duty upon the preaching friars. From the fourteenth century on bishops urged this duty on the parish clergy. Homiletical material was found in the "Legends of the Saints" of Jacob of Voragine (q.v.). Other homiletic sources were the *Gesta Romanorum*, the *Apiarus* of Thomas of Brabant, the *Summa prædicatorum* of Bromyard of Oxford, the *Biblia pauperum* (q.v.), the *Repertorium aureum* of Anthony Rampigollis, and the *Sermones amici*. Toward the end of this period short addresses without exordiums became common. A special variety of sermons were the *Collationes*, used in cloisters and other places of communal life at midday, somewhat free in form and based on the Gospel for the day. Of historical value are the German "Plenaries," collections of house sermons, short, based on Gospel or epistle for the day, with summary of parts of the mass. Mention may be made of the sermons of German Alsatia, which partake of the qualities of the Schwarzwald preacher; they belong to the end of the thirteenth century. They are picturesque and instructive, simple, earnest, and edifying.

2. Characteristics of the Sermon.

As the entire theology of the mystics seeks to obtain subjective certainty in religious matters through personal experience, so their preaching appeals to the inner perception. So completely was this method in control that the events of Biblical history were used allegorically and applied to the purpose of edification. One effect was emphasis upon Christ, and the scholastic preaching was changed to a deeper, warmer, more searching and edifying appeal. The sermons of Cardinal Bonaventura (q.v.) display a mingling of the scholastic and mystical. Mysticism controls the sermons of Eckhart (q.v.). Since the doubt has once more been raised by the Teutonic scholar O. Behaghel (*Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, xxxiv. 530 sqq.) whether there are extant any considerable numbers of Eckhart's discourses, the decision respecting his position as a preacher must be reserved. John Tauler (q.v.), the most edifying preacher of the Middle Ages, surpassed Eckhart as a preacher, though not as a thinker, combining lucidity with religious strength. Henry Suso (q.v.) excelled as an exponent of emotional mysticism. Other names of note among the mystics are Eckhart the younger (see MYSTICISM), Henry of Nördlingen, Herrmann of Fritzlar, Henry Ruysbroek, the canonist Geert Groote, and Johann Charlier Gerson (qq.v.).

3. Preaching of the Mystics.

Constituting a class by themselves were the "Reformers before the Reformation." The influence of John Wyclif (q.v.) was not confined to England, since through John Huss (q.v.) his activities affected the Continent. Wyclif preached both in Latin and English, but the style in each is different. The Latin sermons were delivered before young theologians; Scripture is the unvarying basis, and the character is expository, but in a thoroughly Catholic-scholastic sense, and not without the use of allegory. Conrad of Waldhausen (d. 1369) preached in Prague against the sins of the period, and also against the begging friars. His own

4. Reformers before the Reformation.

preaching was correctly ecclesiastical. His sermons in German have perished, and there is extant only a collection of Latin sermons, the *Postilla studentium*, homilies upon the pericopes from the Gospels, allegorical and scholastic in character. Like Conrad, devoted to ethical reform, was Militsch of Kremsier (q.v.); his pupil Mathias of Janow (d. 1394) left a collection of homilies. John Huss is in a not unworthy sense dependent upon Wyclif. He was noted for his activities as preacher before synods as for his popular sermons in the fields and woods, in the large centers of population and in the little villages. His synodal sermons in Latin are extant, preached before the clergy. What is striking is the courage with which he attacked the vices of the pastoral clergy. His sermons to the people often contain patristic citations, and the Biblical exegesis is not free from arbitrariness. To be named with Huss is his friend Jerome of Prague (q.v.). In this class must be placed Savonarola (q.v.), whose work was done chiefly through preaching, at first outside and then in Florence. He himself issued only his sermons on Ps. lxxiii.; but others in Italian exist in the reports of his friends, those on I John in the Latin. These sermons differ both in occasion and method. Those on I John are exegetical with practical application, while others have little relation to the text and are more exactly practical. Formally his sermons are based on the Bible, really they are made the basis of the expression of his weighty thought. He was a mighty preacher of repentance, a scourge of the vices of the times, especially of the priests, possessed of a warmth of sentiment, keen perceptions, command of his mother speech, dramatic gestures, and a melodious voice.

3. Close of the Middle Ages: It is not easy to pronounce upon the preaching at the end of the Middle Ages. Its practise was often enjoined, and it appears to have been frequent in the cities, but the villages were almost bereft of it. In 1511 in the diocese of Mainz many priests were pronounced completely disqualified for preaching, while toward the end of the fifteenth century in the South German states it cost a considerable sum to secure a preacher for certain festivals. In Breslau the bishop limited the preaching on Sundays to a single sermon, during the rest of the year only on Friday except in the fasting and advent seasons, when there was preaching also on Wednesday. In some parts the secular clergy had only a small part in the function of preaching; thus in Halle there were preachers from the Augustinians, Dominicans, Franciscans, and Servites, but only one secular preacher is named; in Nuremberg the preachers were all monks. Yet the general practise was to have preaching on Sundays and festivals, and on many other occasions, such as New Year's day In the cloisters sermons from abroad were read at mealtimes; in the churches such sermons were practically worked over; there is a varying degree of independence shown in different cases. The general worth of these sermons was small. A special class of addresses were the indulgence-sermons. The preachers of these spared no pains to make them attractive and effectual. The assailants of the indulgence were pictured as sent by Satan; and the indulgence was urged by reference to the sufferings of Jesus Christ, by praise of Mary, by appeals to the hearers' affection and sympathy. The structure of the sermon was still under the influence of scholasticism; a formula of greeting, the text or theme, the exordium and divisions, the Lord's prayer or *Ave Maria*, the discussion, a short conclusion, and the Amen or *dixi* ("I have spoken") or both, was the usual order. The whole period is one of decline in homiletical power. This opinion has been controverted by Pfleger (*Zur Geschichte des Predigtwesens in Strassburg vor Geiler von Kaysersberg*, Strasburg, 1907), who has in mind the orthodoxy and religious earnestness of a series of less prominent preachers of Strasburg in the first half of the fifteenth century. But his own work affords no data for the second half of that century, and does not require a withdrawing of the statement.

1. Frequency and Worth of the Sermon.

Preachers of this period who belong to the Brothers of the Common Life (see COMMON LIFE, BRETHREN OF THE) were Johann Veghe (q.v.) and Thomas a Kempis (q.v.). Notable too were the festival sermons (*Quadragesimale*) of the Franciscan Johann Gritsch of Basel, delivered in German and then translated into Latin with learned scholastic discussions and many citations from the classics, fables, anecdotes, and moral applications; the *Sermones aurei* of the Dominican Johann Nider; the sermons of Johann Herolt, popular because of their practicality and concreteness; the *Dormi secure* ("sleep in safety") of Johann von Werden (c. 1450); the *Hortulus reginæ* of the beloved Meffreth of Meissen, all which passed through many editions. The sermons of Jakob Jüterbock (d. 1465) reveal the vanishing of the hope for a general reformation of the Church. The sermons of Nicholas of Cusa (q.v.) are humanistic, logical, rhetorical, and rational; Gabriel Biel (q.v.) was diligent and keen, but had a clumsy, detailed style. A type of the preacher of indulgences is found in Johann Jenser von Paltz (q.v.), whose *Himmliche Fundgrube* includes a number of sermons published in response to the desires of several princes. He published also a Latin collection, *Cœlifodina*, and in 1502 a *Supplementum Cœlifodinæ* as a pattern for indulgence sermons. The Hungarian Franciscan Pelbart of Temesvar (c. 1500) shows how to dissect a text into its minutest parts in his *Sermones pomarii de tempore et sanctis*. Ulrich Krafft of Ulm (d. 1516) was instructive, earnest, thorough, and popular; Johann Meder of Basel (1494) used extensively the dialogue; Johann Trithemius (q.v.) was simple, practical, and Biblical in his *Sermones et exhortationes ad monachos;* Johannes Hegelin de Lapide was an earnest wisher of reform in the Church; Silvester Prierias (q.v.) exhibited a lingering scholasticism in his *Rosa aurea* (1503). Danish preachers were Martin Petri (d. 1515) and Christiern Pedersen; in Spain there was Vincent Ferrar (q.v.), the Franciscan Bernhardin of Sienna with his *Sermones de evangelio æterno*, Giovanni di Capistrano (see CAPISTRANO, GIOVANNI DI); in Italy there were Leonhard of

2. Individual Preachers.

Utino (d. 1400), Bernhardin of Busti (d. after 1500), and Roberto Caracciolo, who was celebrated as a second Paul. In Germany the decline of preaching showed itself in the serene Augustinian Gottschalk Hollen in Osnabrück (d. after 1481). In France the Minorite Olivier Maillard exhibited the declension in style which included the profane and the burlesque as characteristics, while his fellow Minorite Michel Menot presents what partakes of the comic and laughable. The sermons of the period contain much that is foreign to Christian edification, and indicate a demand for the renewing of Christian life.

III. The Continental Pulpit in Modern Times—

1. The Period of the Reformation: The age of the Reformation marks a new stage in the history of preaching. The central truths of salvation being drawn anew from Scripture, the sermon engendered a new Church with a service the central point of which was the sermon, and this was again the means of a new activity in pulpit oratory. Yet this new development was confined almost entirely to the Protestant Church. In this period various streams of ecclesiastical life make their contribution to the river of sermons. The age of the Reformation forms the first period in this new age, the sermon developing in the Lutheran and then in the Reformed Church; the period of Spener and the coming of Pietism marked a new stage. A second period is noted by the sermon of Protestant orthodoxy, in Germany especially by polemic and confessional dogmatism. There is to be considered the Roman Catholic preaching of the period from the beginning of the seventeenth to the middle of the eighteenth century, especially the brilliant French product. Pietism, orthodoxy, and supernaturalism fought with rationalism on this ground during the eighteenth and part of the nineteenth century. The nineteenth century makes in itself a period of note. The new start of pulpit oratory took its rise in the deep thirst of the soul for a certainty in the experience of grace and of righteousness. There was a general demand for the bettering of ecclesiastical conditions, but leaders of impressive personality were needed to bring about the change, men who drew inspiration from the Scriptures and from their own experience of salvation. When these came forward, the Reformation could owe its success largely to preaching. The keynote of this was the Bible, by which the Reformers satisfied the longing of their own hearts, and its message of salvation in Christ. The preachers broke through the scholastic method and returned to the Biblical homily. The protest against Rome led to a development of the vernacular as against the Latin ecclesiastical tongue, and this played a great part in the unfolding of the sermon. From the work of Luther's Bible the vernacular sprang from the position of a dialect to that of a great speech, and became indeed the speech of the Protestants. The new constitution and basis of the clergy had also its effect, combined with the new order of service, which was no more prevailingly liturgical, while the sermon became indispensable.

1. The Controlling Factors.

Luther probably preached to the monks in the Erfurt period before 1508, and by 1509 he had preached in the monastery churches at Wittenberg and at Erfurt. After 1514 he assumed also the duty of preaching in the Wittenberg parish church; about 1517 he was preaching twice a day regularly on Sundays and feast days; after 1522 he preached to the monks early and afterward in the parish church, and after Bugenhagen became city pastor in 1523, Luther often took his place. There are extant Latin sermons going back to 1515 or perhaps 1514; a series of sermons in Latin dating from 1514–17, preached in the parish church, the former and some of the latter still scholastic in type, though the public sermons are practical. His sermons of 1516–17 on the Commandments are in his "Latin Remains"; those on the Lord's Prayer (1517) he worked over and published in 1519. Steady progress toward practicality is discernible as the time goes on. After 1516 he shows the influence of Mysticism, which came to mean much for him, and grace and faith are already significant for him. In 1521 appeared at the direction of the elector the first part of a collection; and the same year he wrote at the Wartburg a series in German on the pericopes, and these with the first part just mentioned, worked over (1522), make the first beginning of German collections, intended for the use of preachers as yet unfitted or inexperienced. Their form is simple, and the aim is to bring out the truth of the Word. From 1522 till 1543 there appeared, either issued by himself or by others (Aurifaber, Andreas Poach, and others), various collections on different subjects and preached on different occasions. The sermons of 1528 on the Catechism formed the basis for the *Deutsche Katechismus* which appeared April, 1529, which served as a pattern for catechetical preaching. His sermons on the Sermon on the Mount appeared 1532. From his sermons at home in the bosom of his family was made up the so-called *Hauspostille*, in which polemics retreats and simple practical exposition controls. The Weimar edition of his works reproduces many other of Luther's sermons than those here noted.

2. Luther.

Surely if the preaching of any Reformer deserves the title of heroic, Luther's does, being the work of a man who was an orator by nature. As in ordinary life so in the pulpit he was unshakably convinced of the verity and righteousness of his cause, while his talents, tempered in the fire of God's word, enabled him to be a fearless path-breaker in his preaching. He had a firm faith in the Gospel which makes free, a hold upon his own certainty of salvation and joy in testifying to it, aptness in reaching the popular heart, an eye open to the facts of life, command of dialectic and oratorical means, and a union of life and doctrine which made an array of force not equalled since apostolic times. He dealt little with history, much with doctrine. In his exposition he freed himself gradually from the use of allegory, choosing the literal sense. Withal, he gave an ethical turn to his preaching, having in mind not the learned but the common people. The form of his sermons is simple, and they contained ever a fundamental and governing ground thought. For dec-

3. His Sermons Characterized.

ades his spirit ruled the German pulpit, his preaching furnishing the model for that of many others. His published sermons served also for the private edification of many who were not reached through the pulpit. Not less valuable were the catechetical sermons, while the sermons to children served especially a need of the times. Yet Luther's method did not become the only one in use. A middle path was struck out between Luther's homily and the thematic sermon. Preachers selected in their discussion of the pericopes a single main thought and discussed the context seriatim, while orderly structure was rare. Scripture as such was central in the Protestant pulpit.

After Luther preachers to be named are Melanchthon, Justus Jonas, Bugenhagen (qq.v.), whose *Indices in evangelicas dominicas* was a handbook for inexperienced preachers; his catechetical sermons of 1525 and 1535 were first published in Leipsic in 1909, being edited, with introduction by G. Buchwald; note further Veit Dietrich (q.v.), mild, simple, clear, warm, and unpolemical, Urbanus Rhegius (q.v.), whose sermons were long, carefully composed, restful, clear in dogmatics, and forceful. Wenceslaus Linck is to be named; so Kaspar Aquila (q.v.), a mighty opponent of the pope; while Johann Spangenberg (d. 1550) had a childlike spirit, full of ripe Evangelical experience. Johann Brenz (q.v.) was one of those who preached whole books through, delivering also many short sermons with theme and subdivisions; Erhard Schnepf (d. 1558) was celebrated for a native eloquence; Anton Corvinus (q.v.) preached briefly on the Gospel and epistle for the day; Michael Cölius (d. 1559) was remarkable for clear arrangement; Andreas Osiander (q.v.) was doctrinal, warm, edifying, and not excessively polemic; Sebastian Fröschel (q.v.) left some catechetical sermons; Nikolaus Amsdorf (q.v.) left some exceedingly polemic yet much admired pulpit addresses; Georg Major (q.v.) in his long but well articulated sermons showed no polemic bitterness, but a marked clarity and mildness. Johann Mathesius (q.v.) was uncommonly fruitful in his pulpit work, and Erasmus Sarcerius (d. 1559) issued a number of collections which were noted for their catechetical value as well as for their exposition of the Lutheran doctrine. Joachim Moerlin (q.v.) left sermons on the Psalms and another collection; he was somewhat marked for polemical ability. Belonging to the Lutheran pulpit was Hans Tausen (d. 1561 as bishop of Ripen), who left a noteworthy collection which, while less polemic than Luther's sermons, yet smacks of the controversy over the Lord's Supper; and Peter Palladius, bishop of Zealand (d. 1560), was a celebrated preacher in the vernacular of his country. From Sweden (see SWEDEN, REFORMATION IN) are to be noted Olaf and Lars Petri, whose style was that of the simple homily, M. Elof, and A. A. Angermanus, who was the champion of the Protestants against the Roman Catholic movement under John III. Hungary produced the noted Mátyás Biró Dévay (q.v.), and Austria, Primus Truber (q.v.) and the later Hans Steinberger (c. 1580).

4. Other Lutheran Reformers.

As preachers neither Zwingli nor Calvin was so significant for the Reformed Church as was Luther for the Lutheran. Zwingli (q.v.) began as early as 1516 in Einsiedeln to explain the mass Biblically. His celebrated sermons against Mariolatry and the like date from 1523. In Zurich he preached from 1519 series of sermons on the New Testament and expounded the Psalms for the country people. Evangelical teaching concerning Christ and his salvation, attempts at a bettering of the ethical conditions, uncovering of the causes of national demoralization, the duty of protecting the confederation, and the social needs of the times were treated by him. His preaching was marked by great clearness, and he took seriously his office as a preacher. While he lacked the mystical depth, the creative imagination, the geniality of discussion and control of language shown by Luther, he was endowed with a power of testifying to the truth and of popular exposition with a unity of thought by no means inferior to the German leader's. He set himself free from the traditional use of the pericopes as the basis for his preaching, and the preachers of Switzerland and of Upper Germany followed him. There is a fundamental difference between the preaching of the Reformed and the Lutheran Churches; the former took to expounding whole books of the Bible, and there was less distinction made between the Old and the New Testament; in the Lutheran Church use was prevailingly made of the pericopes, and only secondarily was exposition of whole books given. The Lutheran Church was more conservative in the observance of church festivals, through which the church year ran its round. Belonging to this school are Kaspar Megander, Heinrich Bullinger (qq.v.), Louis Lavater of Zurich (d. 1586), who handled well the Old Testament, Rudolf Gualther (d. 1586), pastor in Zurich, who also preached on the Old Testament, and Johann Wolf (d. 1571), pastor and professor in Zurich. Œcolampadius and Calvin encouraged by their habit preaching on entire books of Scripture. Thus Calvin dealt with I Samuel, Job, the twelve Minor Prophets, and with detached chapters, while over 2,000 sermons, mostly unprinted, show his extreme diligence. He appealed rather to the cultivated than to the masses. His method was exegetical, typological (not allegorical), doctrinal, somewhat lengthy, and without reference to the church year. The reformatory activity of Guillaume Farel (q.v.) was much helped by his preaching, though none of his sermons are extant. Theodore Beza (q.v.) is not particularly noted for his pulpit oratory, but his sermons were directed during his public life in Geneva to efficient purpose. Still to be mentioned are Berthold Haller, Martin Butzer, and Wolfgang Capito (qq.v.). Of significance as a preacher is Ambrosius Blaurer (q.v.), whose earlier sermons were richly allegorical, while those of a later period were illustrated from practical life; they are, however, simple, earnest, and deeply religious. His contemporary in Constance, Jean Zwick (q.v.), was a keen but kindly preacher. Of the sermons of Johannes a Lasco (q.v.) no examples have come down. In the Netherlands worked Petrus Dathenus (q.v.); Herman Modet of Oudenard,

5. Zwingli and the Early Reformed Preachers.

who after 1566 spoke to many thousands in the intrenched camps near Ghent; and Huib. Duifhuis of Utrecht (d. 1575). In France there was the Minorite François Lambert (q.v.), whose sermons on repentance had a Scriptural foundation, and Augustin Marlorat du Pasquier, an exegetical preacher. For Italy it is sufficient to cite the names and refer to the articles on Ochino, Paleario, Valdez, Vergerio, and Vermigli. Spain produced Juan de Avila (q.v.).

The preaching of the Roman Catholic Church of the sixteenth century was ruled by the spirit of polemic against the Reformation, so that the declamation against heresy was its prevailing motif.

6. The Roman Catholic Pulpit.

Yet the homiletic activity of Protestantism drove the Roman Catholic Church to renewed activity, as is shown by the pronouncement at the Council of Trent, session V., chap. 2. Without significance were the exposition of the Gospels (1532) by Johann Eck (q.v.) and the *Postilla Catholica* of Martin Eisengrein (1576); more important were the German collections, homilies on the festivals, and repentance-sermons of the Dominican Johann Wild of Mainz (d. 1554). Georg Wicel (q.v.) holds a middle position between the two. Stanislaus Hosius (q.v.) is also to be named here, while among the prelates at Trent is Bishop Musso of Vitonto. Carlo Borromeo (q.v.) was himself a diligent preacher, and he worked for a better effect from the preaching of his clergy through his own pastoral and homiletical instructions. One of the last stars in the Spanish firmament was Luis of Granada (d. 1588), lively, even fiery, and full of psychological strength. In France the extremities of hatred of heresy found expression during the Huguenot wars. Particular instances of preachers here are Bishop Vigor of Narbonne, Edmund Angier, Jean Boucher, Aubry, Rose, and others. The rise of new orders in the Roman Catholic Church had its effect upon that church's preaching. Among these may be named the Theatines and the Capuchins (qq.v.), whose work was directed to pastoral ends as well as against the Reformation. But still more influential than these were the Jesuits, whose purpose was the spread of Catholicism throughout the earth, largely through the means of the sermon. Noteworthy here is the name of Cardinal Bellarmine (q.v.).

2. Protestant Orthodox Pulpit, 1580–1700: This was of a confessional character. In place of the fresh and spirited witness-bearing of the Reformation, an insipid dogmatism, combined with a harsh polemic engendered by the controversies of the times, characterized the sermon.

1. The New Scholasticism.

A new scholasticism arose, which increasingly infected the sermon as the seventeenth century advanced. The simple analytical style disappeared; in its place came the method which developed a number of *loci*, "heads," which were then unfolded. Preaching attached itself rather to Melanchthon than to Luther, it took the way of formal rhetorical development, and so the freedom of movement gained in the Reformation was lost. Textual consideration was given, the aim was to make the sermon a unit; the method of development was not always that of rhetorical norms—of exordium, development, application, and peroration—yet some such arrangement as this, with permutations of placing of the different parts, governed the machinery or framework, while a scheme for the sermon was thoroughly worked out on scholastic lines. Especially favored was the fivefold division, so that the sermon was regarded as imperfect which did not treat its matter in this way. Modifications of the scheme of the sermon came to have names of their own—the Leipsic method, the Jena method, the Helmstedt method, etc., according to the place where special types of treatment were in vogue. Alongside of this formalism, great influence upon the sermon was exerted by the restraint imposed by the use of the pericopes as the basis of preaching. The way this worked out is illustrated by the case of the elder Carpzov (q.v.), who in a ministry of fifty years had to preach from the same text fifty times. There was a difference between the preaching in town and in country, though most of the examples which have survived are from the town. Upon the country pastors was urged the duty of simple paraphrastic exposition. The degeneration of the sermon shows itself at the end of the seventeenth century in the work of such men as Christian Weise of Zittau (d. 1708) and Christian Weidling (d. 1731), who developed the "emblematic" sermon and were followed by many preachers who carried the style to extremes. Thus a preacher in 1642 used Ps. cxxxiv. 2, with the theme "The spiritual thankful hand," and described (1) the little ear-finger which keeps our ears clean; (2) the gold finger of faith; (3) the middle finger of many virtues; (4) the index-finger of John the Baptist; and (5) the strong thumb of sure confidence. The younger Carpzov preached for a year upon Christ as a workman; thus upon the basis of Matt. vi. 25 he dealt with Christ as the best clothmaker, and so on. Still this rage for the emblematic sermon was not universal, and a fine series of practical and edifying discourses were delivered in this period. Besides the pericopes, which were usual as texts in the sixteenth century and obligatory in the seventeenth, the catechism, here and there a confessional writing, hymns and proverbs were used as the basis of the sermon. The length of the discourse increased from three-quarters of an hour to two hours, funeral sermons were still longer in proportion to the dignity of the deceased. In most communities there were three discourses on Sunday, and sermons on the feast and fast days.

A general characteristic of this period was a polemic confessional dogmatism. "Pure doctrine" was a catchword of the times, which was sought by discourses in dry scholastic form with theological learning and vexatious disputations, while Evangelical sustenance of the spirit was not furnished.

2. Style and Content of the Sermon.

Among the names of this period are Tilemann Hesshusen (q.v.), Andreas Pancratius (d. 1576; noted for his dialectic and closely woven reasoning), Jakob Andreä (q.v.) and Nikolaus Selnecker (q.v.), a fellow worker in the field of confessional construction. Polemical in type are the sermons of Artomades in Königsberg and Johann Prätorius (who preached on

the three-headed Antichrist—pope, Turk, and Calvinist). Lukas Osiander (q.v.) was one of the most passionate polemists of the period. The two preachers named Johann Benedikt Carpzov (q.v.) were scholastic in type; Philipp Nicolai (q.v.) was reserved in polemics and better known for his hymns. Deserving of mention are Hoe von Höenegg and Konrad Dannhauer (qq.v.), while Hermann Samson of Riga, who could not pass over a point of controversy, yet built up excellent illustrations and comparisons. Alongside of this dry scholastic method there was found a practical, edifying preaching, with a mystical coloring; besides the merely intellectual, the polemically keen and the didactical-dogmatic there was a living, warm, and popular style of discourse, taking thought for the religious and ethical needs of life. Orthodoxy had, however, so strong a hold on the times that sermons were written, e.g., upon the greetings, the titles and signatures of the epistles. How minute were the details noticed may be seen by the fact that G. Strigenitz (d. 1603) preached in Meissen 122 sermons on the Book of Jonah! Examples of the better style of preachers are Johann Gigas in Freystadt (d. 1581), Johann Habermann (q.v.), Hieronymus Mencel in Eisleben (d. 1690), Martin Mirus, court preacher in Dresden (d. 1593), Ægidius Hunnius (q.v.), Jacob Heerbrand and Martin Chemnitz (qq.v), the eloquent Georg Mylius of Wittenberg, his colleague Polykarp Leyser (q.v.), a foe of all affectation, practical and fearless in application of the truth. Zealous for the coming of the kingdom of Christ was the diligent Stephan Prätorius of Salzwedel (q.v.). Worthy of notice is the practical and Biblically based work of Lukas Osiander (q.v.; d. 1604), whose products were illumined by touches of humor. His *Bauernpostille* (1597 sqq.) is well known, in which he insisted that for the poor peasantry citations and disputations should be omitted, for whom short sermons were the more suitable.

Out of the sorrowful period of the Thirty Years' War, with its desolation of schools and universities, and the consequent lowering of educational tone, comes Johann Arndt (q.v.), with whom may be named the earnest and practical preachers of Danzig, Dilger (d. 1645), Blanck (d. 1637), and Rathmann (d. 1628); the earnest and strong Paul Egard of Nottorp in Holstein (c. 1620) preached without learned ostentation. Comparable to Arndt in spirituality and depth of feeling is Valerius Herberger (q.v.), while Johann Matthäus Meyfart (q.v.) opposed scholastic and errant Christianity and was particularly Biblical in his preaching. Akin in spirit to Arndt was Martin Geier of Leipsic (d. 1680). Seldom mentioned yet worthy of notice is the practical, learned, and Biblical Konrad Dieterich of Ulm (d. 1639), who left several volumes of sermons remarkable for learning, sound conclusions, fresh illustrations, and irenic spirit. Less significant was the Wittenberg professor Balthasar Meisner (q.v.). Johann Heermann (q.v.) preached the splendor of the Gospel with lively effect and soul-saving earnestness, leaving several volumes of discourses, especially worthy of mention among which is his *Nuptialia* (Nuremberg, 1657). Johann Gerhard (q.v.) is not to be passed by. Among faithful shepherds of their flocks must be named Justus Gesenius (q.v.), whose sermons on the Gospels and epistles are thorough; but as a preacher he was excelled by Johann Valentin Andreä (q.v.), who promoted a deeper comprehension of Scripture. A preacher full of wit and humor was Johann Balthasar Schuppius (q.v.), original, spiritual, fresh, satirical but earnest. Free from all false rhetoric was Joachim Lütkemann (q.v.), whose sermons treat of the Gospels and epistles. Worthy also was Heinrich Müller (q.v.), as was Christian Scriver. The great exegete of the seventeenth century, Sebastian Schmidt (d. 1696) left over 100 sermons on Biblical and confessional topics. Others who displayed somewhat of the spirit of Arndt were: Johann Lassenius of Bernstadt and Copenhagen (d. 1692), who left numerous volumes of sermons which display Biblical learning and concise thoughtfulness; Lütkens of Cologne-on-the-Spree (d. 1712), who helped transplant the spirit of Spener into Scandinavia; the Scriptural and practical Häberlin of Stuttgart (d. 1699), and the learned Caspar Neumann (q.v.), whose sermons were exegetical. Dilherr of Nuremberg, who was both a poet and an educator, left two volumes of sermons; Arnold Mengering (d. in Halle 1646) was a preacher of repentance; Joachim Schröder of Rostock (d. 1677) was especially severe against the vices of the times; Gottlob Cober (d. 1717) was the author of widely celebrated and circulated volumes of discourses. Eccentric in type were Jobst Sackmann (d. 1718), humorous, naive, yet true to life in his delineations, and the South German preacher Spörrer of Rechenberg (c. 1720). Heterodox in style was Valentin Weigel of Zschopau (d. 1588), preaching an intellectualism and a mystical spiritualism in opposition to the scholastic dogmatism of the period. In Denmark Niels Hemmingsen (q.v.) was noted for the finished style of his discourse, while Jesper Rasmussen Brockmand (q.v.), whose *Sabbati sanctificatio* went through fourteen editions, was Scriptural and thorough; Dinesin Jersin (d. 1634) was a forerunner of Pietism and one of the most influential preachers of Denmark. In Sweden the pulpit lagged a full generation behind Germany. From about 1600 the Christian faith was handled as sheer knowledge, though orthodoxism was not so much in the foreground as in Germany. Prominent and strong in the exposition of Christian verities were Bishop Rudbeck in Westerås (d. 1646), and J. Botvidi, court preacher to Gustavus Adolphus II. J. Matthiä (d. 1670) appealed more to the emotions; J. E. Terser, bishop of Linköping (d. 1678), was a representative of syncretism. Johannes Gezelius the elder (q.v.), the eloquent Archbishop Hagain Spegel (end of the seventeenth century), and Jesper Svedberg (d. 1735) were among the greatest preachers of Sweden, uniting warmth of faith, clarity, and oratorical brilliance with artistic construction.

3. Individual Names.

In the Reformed Church the sermon presented much the same features as in the Lutheran, working along emblematic and allegorical lines, though the tendency was toward a simpler style with less adornment, perhaps due to the influence of Andreas Hyperius (q.v.). A good representative of the

German Reformed preachers is Abraham Scultetus (q.v.), and others are Johann Müller, Felix Wyss of Zurich (d. 1666), Bernhard Meier of Bremen (d. 1681), and Samuel Eyen of Bern (d. 1700). Friedrich Adam Lampe (q.v.) led the Cocceian Biblical-practical reaction against scholastic orthodoxy. Here is to be mentioned also Johannes Amos Comenius (q.v.), the most significant preacher of the Bohemian Brethren, whose discourses were characterized by quiet exposition, thoroughgoing exegesis of prophecy and fulfilment, and careful arrangement and articulation. In the Reformed Church outside Germany arose a real eloquence, responding more quickly to national conditions. This was especially the case in France, where the political conditions were favorable. The polemic was principally anti-Roman. The more forward condition of the national tongue made easy the productions of pulpit orators after classical models. A stimulus was found in the French literature of the period before and under Louis XIV and in the brilliant oratory of the Roman Catholic Church. Pierre Du Moulin (q.v.), the most popular Protestant preacher of France, showed less of the oratorical than of a simplicity of illustration, thought, and direction expressed in frank, emphatic, terse, and lively language. Michel de Faucheur of Montpellier and Paris used little of art in his work, which was essentially exegetical and anti-Roman. Moïse Amyraut (q.v.) displayed a native oratorical talent, but was dogmatic in tone and synthetic in construction. Rather didactic in type were Jean Daille (q.v.), who left twenty volumes of sermons, and Samuel Bochart (q.v.). While thus far the analytic and polemic had prevailed, the synthetic style began with Jean Claude (q.v.). But with the revocation of the Edict of Nantes began an exodus of the best French preachers. Claude, whose eloquence in controversy made even a Bossuet tremble for his hearers, by the firmness of his character, his manly earnestness, his majestic calm, his precision, and clarity earned the position of one of the foremost preachers of his time. Such preachers as Ancillon, Abbadie, Lenfant, and Beausobre (qq.v.) were surpassed by Daniel de Superville of Rotterdam (d. 1728), who in lovable disposition, speculative might, and philosophical endowment surpassed his predecessors. Jacques Saurin (q.v.) attained the high point of French Reformed preaching for the eighteenth century; of less significance were Jacob Basnage (q.v.) and Henri Chatelain (d. 1743). In Holland the pulpits echoed with the dogmatic wrangling of Remonstrants (q.v.) and Counterremonstrants. The school of Gysbert Voetius was influenced by scholasticism and the analytical method, devoted to the justification of dogma. For a year the whole church of Holland was moved by a sermon of Conrad Vorst (q.v.) on long hair (I Cor. xi. 14), and Smijtegeld (d. 1739) preached 145 sermons on "the bruised reed." Of a better class were Hellenbroek of Rotterdam (d. 1731) and the more practical W a Brakel (d. 1711). When the homiletic practise through the Cocceian school broke away from its scholastic bonds, the prophetic-typical style entered, though remaining drily philological. But gradually life invigorated the dead orthodoxy of the pulpit in the discourses of David Flud van Giffen (d. 1701), Jan d'Outrein (d. in Amsterdam 1722), and H. Groenewegen. Antischolastic preaching was heard from J. Uytenbogaert (q.v.) of the Remonstrants, and Philip van Limborch (q.v.) of the Arminians.

4. The Reformed Pulpit.

Apart from the brilliant flight of Roman Catholic pulpit oratory in France, mission preaching and compact addresses to the peasantry ruled inside that Church. In Italy in the seventeenth century in the missions of Jesuits and other orders, sermons on penitence and confession were the order of the day. The Jesuit Paolo Segneri (q.v.) traversed Italy for twenty years preaching, and with him should be named his nephew of the same name (d. 1713). A continuator of the homely discourse to the peasantry was the Augustinian André of France (d. 1675); a preacher of note was the Augustinian Abraham a Sancta Clara (q.v.). The direct opposite of this folk-sermon was exhibited in the discourse of the brilliantly oratorical pulpit of France in the period of Louis XIV., the basis of which was less in the church itself than in the circumstances of the times and in the general literature of the nation; the pulpit strove for a revival of the eloquence of the early Church. The result was an oratory only for the cultured, to the embellishment of which the graces of rhetoric were skilfully lent. The substance dealt with morality, the fear of God, inculcation of virtues, meditation upon death and its meaning, lessons from history and life. And the results came, with just pride in their finished form, to be included in the classical literature of the nation, and to be regarded as models of style to be employed in the Church both in France and elsewhere. A pathbreaker was the general of the Oratorians, J. F. Sénault (d. 1670); the brightest star in this constellation was Jacques Bénigne Bossuet (q.v.), whose eloquence flamed; his flow of thought was full and genial, and his imagination creative. Of special celebrity were his funeral sermons, and not a few of these belong to the masterpieces of French style. Among these may be mentioned his oration over Henriette Marie, that at the death of the duke of Orléans, and that over the bier of the Prince of Condé, from which cultured Frenchmen make quotations as from classics. One of the faults which somewhat repels, however, is the flattery directed to court circles; unworthy of the house of God are the epithets constantly applied to the king, and the unfortunate impression made is sometimes that of a man-serving courtier. But even more than was accomplished by Bossuet for the uplift of the French pulpit came about through Louis Bourdaloue (q.v.), especially by his passion sermons and those with the title *Dei virtutem*. After him is to be named Esprit Fléchier (q.v.), whose sermon on Turenne is his masterpiece, on whom J. Mascaron of Versailles (d. 1703) also delivered a celebrated discourse. Another star in this constellation was the Oratorian Jean Baptist Massillon (q.v.), among whose celebrated sermons are that on the Prodigal Son, that on Matt. v. 3 sqq., on Luke iv. 27, that on the deity of Christ—a model dog-

5. The Roman Catholic Pulpit.

matic sermon—the ten little sermons of 1718 which were intended as exhortations for the young king, which were so marked by terseness yet grace of diction that they were regarded as patterns. Massillon is distinguished for high ethical earnestness, remarkable frankness, and a sympathetic tone, and the totality of excellent qualities found in his work gained for him the title of "the Racine of the pulpit." Fenelon (q.v.) is sharply distinguished from the brilliant Bossuet by the fact that his discourses owe their strength to the element of prayerfulness, meditation on the divine, instructive spirituality, and use of Christian experience. With Massillon closed the classic period of the French pulpit. The Jesuit Segaud (d. 1748), Paulle, and especially the missioner J. Bridaine (d. 1767) are representatives of the post-classical period.

3. Transformation of the Protestant Pulpit, 1700–1810. The next period shows the battle of Pietism and ecclesiastical orthodoxy, of supernaturalism and the Enlightenment (q.v.). With Spener began a pulpit service which had a practical aim of upbuilding upon the basis of faith and a consecrated life. The means was a faithful and diligent exposition of Scripture. Mechanical confessions of salvation in Christ alone became experienced salvation, external ecclesiasticism became a living attachment to the true body of Christ. The form of the sermon became simpler, the structure more distinct, the expression plainer. The development was gradual, the movements in theology having their influence as the relations of Pietism and orthodoxy changed, and as the new philosophy and the Enlightenment and supernaturalism contributed to the unfoldings of the period.

1. Pietism.

Philipp Jakob Spener (see PIETISM, I.) gave in his *Pia desideria*, chap. vi., and in his *Theologische Bedenken*, vols. iii.–iv., worthful hints for the reform of the sermon. The discourse was to have as its aim the renewing of man by faith and the production of the fruits thereof in life. Yet Spener accomplished more through his personality than by the too learned and dry method of his preaching. Spener sought with painstaking endeavor to exhaust the dogmatic and ethical content of the text by an exact and extended exegesis. His discourses were often lacking in unity, the cause being a sort of prelude to the sermon used in order to attain comprehensiveness. Yet by his clear reference to Scripture, his simple and practical-fruitful application, and by the employment of ethical themes and a strongly ethical trend of the dogmatic material he drew crowds to his church and became the introducer of a strong stimulus for the Lutheran Church and its pulpit. His principal collections are those upon the Gospels for the year 1688, *Evangelische Lebenspflichten* (1693), *Evangelischer Glaubenstrost* (1694), sixty-six sermons on the article dealing with regeneration (1695), and a considerable number of volumes on various subjects and occasions. The Halle school of preaching soon gained great celebrity and preeminence. Its characteristic was a greater simplicity in form, while the application was a matter of more concern than the development of doctrine. August Hermann Francke (q.v.), who left several volumes of discourses, showed a simpler structure than Spener, followed the course of the text rather than a theme, though his handling of the material was somewhat mechanical, and the treatment verbose. In content his sermons were practical, and what he produced was individual in character, free in its method, and essentially quick in substance. Johann Anastasius Freylinghausen (q.v.) employed, as did Spener, a prelude, and his theme and division are inartistic. Joachim Justus Breithaupt (q.v.) was less influential as a preacher than as an instructor and furtherer of the new tendency in learning. Joachim Lange (q.v.) was more a teacher of homiletic theology than a preacher. Gottfried Arnold (q.v.) took high rank by his pulpit work. The Gotha superintendent, Georg Nitsch (d. 1729), was a man of great freshness of spirit, exact knowledge of Scripture, possessed of humor, able to appeal to the popular ear, keen in his denunciation of sin, and sturdy in his appeals for the realization of the Christian virtues in life.

2. Spener and His Followers.

The later Halle school failed in that it too frequently spoke over the heads of the congregation in its effort for the didactic and the intellectual; it stressed emotion, producing warmth rather than light. The great teacher and exegete of this school was Johann Jakob Rambach (q.v.), a man of fine grain and irenic spirit, whose *Præcepta Homiletica* aimed at a simpler, more lucid and natural, practical yet text-true development of theme and exposition in the year's round of sermons. He united intelligible clarity with Christian heartiness and warmth, a poetic and lively imagination with a strong depth of thought. He used a short introduction, simple arrangement based on the text, logical order, a clear and living development on the basis of the best of North German Pietism. Nevertheless he exhibited that schematic stiffness in the arrangement of his sermons which was a heritage from the seventeenth century, as well as a wearying uniformity, which grew out of pietistic leanings, in the practical application of his sermons to converted and unconverted (new matter is to be found concerning him in M. Schian's *J. J Rambach als Prediger und Predigtheoretiker*, in *Beiträge zur hessischen Kirchengeschichte*, vol. iv., Darmstadt, 1909). Among his imitators are Johann Philipp Fresenius (q.v.), Johann F Starck (d. 1756), author of a *Hausgebetsbuch* (new ed. by Heim, 1845), and Abbot Steinmetz of Bergen (d. 1762). Württemberg produced a series of preachers who developed a fresh, healthy, and many-sided method which has lasted till the present. The characteristics of this school are a firm, realistic, in part mystic Bible faith, with a broad conception of the organism of revelation, real churchmanship, a free and scientific development, and unconstrained construction of the doctrinal basis, especially on the eschatological side. The forerunners were Heinrich Häberlin, named above, Johann Andreas and Johann Friedrich Hochstetter (both d. 1720), Johann Reinhard Hedinger (q.v.), and the best preacher of them all, Georg Konrad Rieger (q.v.). Johann Albrecht Bengel (q.v.) is less famous as a preacher than as an exegete, though his sermons show a classical repose

3. Various Schools.

and penetration, and a method of exposition almost catechetical in type. Friedrich Christian Oetinger (q.v.) by his singular mystic-speculative art won a special place in the history of preaching. Now he interwove great thoughts in apothegmatic method, again he dealt with daily life in naive yet popular fashion, once more soared high above the mental range of his hearers, or, again, he spoke from a lower level of thought and conception. His sermons were collected by K. C. E. Ehmann (5 vols., Reutlingen, 1852–57). The speculative branch of the school of Bengel was represented further by Philipp Matthaeus Hahn (q.v.) and J. L. Fricker of Dettingen (d. 1766). The practical branch is naturally represented by a series of preachers Biblical-Evangelical in type rather than specifically Pietistic. Among them may be named Friedrich Christoph Steinhofer and the less known Immanuel Gottlob Brastberger (qq.v.). A special gift of originality was possessed by Philipp David Burk of Kirchheim (d. 1770), in whose *Sammlungen zur Pastoraltheologie* (new ed. by Oehler, Stuttgart, 1867) are found excellent counsels on homiletic subjects. Similarly, Christian Samuel Ulber of Hamburg (d. 1776) left a rich material in his *Erbauliche Denkzetteln* (new ed., Kiel, 1847). Karl Heinrich Rieger, son of the Georg Konrad Rieger already named, surpassed his father in his appreciation of the essential points of the Gospel. In this company belong the noted exegete, apologete, and author Magnus Friedrich Roos, Jeremias Friedrich Reuss of Tübingen, and the exceedingly original pedagog Johann Friedrich Flattich (qq.v.). From the Reformed Church should be reckoned here the pious mystic and poet Gerhard Tersteegen (q.v.).

A sort of acme of the Halle method, though not without elements of disagreement, was achieved by the preaching of the Moravian Brethren. There were certain ideas which received such emphasis in the pulpit of the latter that other points of the Christian faith were, so to speak, lost to view.

4. The Moravian Pulpit.

Some of these ideas were faith in the merits of Christ and his atoning blood, a childlike trust in the grace of the Lord, an assurance of confidence in the wounds of the Lamb, and the consciousness of possession of the Savior and his bride-like love. With this went a disregard of arrangement, a too frequent use of certain catchwords, together with appeals to the emotions. The founder, Count von Zinzendorf (q.v.), was the most significant and original of their pulpit orators, as well as one of the most diligent. He had many of the qualities of a great speaker—an intense passion for Christ, an excellent education, geniality, lively emotions, rich imagination and flow of thought, and great strength of language. His discourses were largely expressions of the affections which stirred his soul, and his constant endeavor was to exalt Christ. He was especially eloquent at ordination and consecration services, in which he often carried his congregation into heights of emotion. It is fortunate that the first extravagant period of the Herrnhut community (1743–50), with its creations of religious fantasy and its insipid and effeminate trifling, was only an episode in the history of the church, with no lasting effects. Bishop August Gottlieb Spangenburg (q.v.) was an example of the clear, sober, and worthy sermonizer. One needs only to mention such names as Bartholomew Ziegenbalg, Benjamin Schultze, Christian Friedrich Schwarz, David Zeisberger, Hans Egede, and Thomas von Westen (qq.v.).

Exponents of ecclesiastical orthodoxy made their appearance especially in Saxony, where the battle with Pietism was especially sharp, and among the number were such pious and practical preachers as Johannes and Gottfried Olearius (qq.v.). Among their opponents were Johann Friedrich Mayer, Samuel Schelwig, Johannes Fecht, and Valentin Ernst Löscher (qq.v.). These diligent and gladly heard men, to whom the work of the pulpit was not a first concern, were not from the old scholasticism. Learned investigations, allegories, mystical comparisons, broke into the instructive formation, though there were present warmth and inspiration. Polemics against the court, which had become Roman Catholic, was a part of the substance. The sermons of Johann August Ernesti were full of conception and illumined by Biblical orientalism, as well as packed with thought. From South Germany mention should be made of the military chaplain Johann Friedrich Flattich, a polemist, fresh and able, against atheism and free thinking. From the Reformed Church in Germany may be named the Berlin court preacher Daniel Ernst Jablonski (q.v.), the Zurich president Johann Jakob Ulrich, and Daniel Stapfer of Bern (q.v.).

4. Reform of the German Pulpit and the Preaching of Rationalism: In consequence of the influence of the stimulus from England and from France the Germans after Mosheim began to lay new emphasis upon pleasing form. As the Enlightenment (q.v.) made way, the striving became great to use logical arrangement and method in the pulpit. But the influence of the Enlightenment covered also the content. Dogmatic propositions, not consonant with "rational" thinking, fell into the background, and the truths of rational verities were put in the front. While the Enlightenment at first combated the ruling supernaturalism (to about 1775), there followed a period when rationalism was in the ascendency (to c. 1810), when a period of emphasis upon Evangelical truths was reached in a reaction partly esthetic and partly Biblical-Evangelical. The period of ruling supernaturalism and germinating rationalism (1740–80) reveals as the starting-point of a better pulpit style Mosheim's translation of selected sermons of Tillotson in 1728. Frederick the Great read to his soldiers his own renderings of the sermons of Bourdaloue, Fléchier, Massillon, and Saurin. To Fléchier and Saurin Mosheim did homage. A prophecy of what was coming was furnished by the Basel preaching professor Samuel Werenfels (q.v.), who was estranged from false pathos, elegant, intelligible, and edifying. He and the sensitive Pierre Roques in Basel (d. 1748) and the fiery court preacher of Berlin, Jaquelot, show how soon the better form of sermon of foreign Reformed theologians could domesticate itself in Germany. Yet the movement was not merely imitative. There was a

1. The Conflicting Influences.

general attempt at the purification and development of the German tongue, as witness the establishment of a professorship of German oratory in Halle before 1730, and a search for a national literature which had its bearing upon the pulpit. This movement dealt also with the matter of the sermon. People were weary alike of the theological quarrels and of Pietistic verbosity. Interest was more and more philosophical, due in part to the influence of the foreign pulpit and the Enlightenment outside Germany, in part to the growing taste at home cultivated by the demonstrative, mathematical-philosophical work of Leibnitz and Wolff. Preachers learned the value of conception, arrangement, solidity, definition, and demonstration. Natural religion as the essential content of the Christian, and morals as the essential of natural religion were emphasized. So Mosheim found a contrast not merely between Pietist and orthodox, but between philosophical and Biblical. The mediation between theology and philosophy was begun by Johann Gustav Reinbeck (d. 1741), who showed careful arrangement, solid application, a correct development of the conception, and union of Biblical and philosophical elements.

2. Mosheim and His School.

Johann Lorenz von Mosheim (q.v.), the German Tillotson or Saurin, revealed an elegant style, an apologetic tendency, a convincing force of proof, strong and sure as it was fine, flowing, and pleasing. In spite of a certain breadth of view, the basis is the Evangelical fundamental doctrines; the aim is to bring to realization the working-out of the verity of Christian doctrine. To this end Mosheim uses historical illustrations, descriptions of the events of the times, all this with fine psychological solidity. His argumentation is thought through and the exposition is wrought out, revealing the divine active force of the Gospel, the divine origin of Christian ethics. The employment of the text is careful, the themes are practical, the discussion is broad and full. Peters (*Der Bahnbrecher der modernen Predigt J. L. Mosheim in seinen homiletischen Anschauungen*, 1910) is undoubtedly right in seeing in Mosheim's preaching and homiletics modern traits. While Mosheim was thus influencing the Lutheran pulpit, Tillotson of England (see below) was doing the same for the German Reformed Church through August Friedrich Wilhelm Sack (q.v.) of Berlin, the religious teacher of Friedrich Wilhelm III. and IV Johann Andreas Cramer (q.v.) was influential more upon the oratorical side, employing a fiery pathos, a wealth of rhetorical figures which sometimes seemed to overload the discourse, but a fullness of thought, clear arrangement, excellent choice of doctrinal and ethical circumstances. Related to him in style was Gottfried Less (q.v.), while Christoph Christian Sturm of Magdeburg and Hamburg (d. 1786) infused a stronger rationalistic strain together with a poetic-esthetic coloring. Among those who followed the new trend of the times were Johann Friedrich Wilhelm Jerusalem and Johann Joachim Spalding (qq.v.).

3. Entrance of Rationalism.

The period of ruling rationalism (1780–1810) had been prepared for by the constantly growing influence of the Enlightenment. There was a decided break in the preaching of this period from that of orthodoxy and Pietism. The orthodox pulpit maintained the integrity of what it held to be the confirmed verities of faith. The Enlightenment was concerned also with preaching "the pure faith of Christians," and naturally there was a connection with Evangelical church teaching. But the content of the rationalistic preaching stressed the doctrines of God, virtue, and immortality; ethics was distinctly in the foreground. This ethical strain was a reaction from the unfruitful and scholastic discourse of orthodoxism, and it led to a handling of the Christian virtues. This turn of work in the pulpit does not suffer when compared with the Pietistic pulpit, though it was in some respects shallower. It protested against the one-sided appeal to the emotions, it called to earnest action and practical activity. It is therefore not to be condemned out of hand, any more than the preaching of orthodoxism is to be considered a sort of bankruptcy. Of course the handling of Scripture in the pulpit of this type corresponded to the method in which the Enlightenment dealt with the Bible, which ruled the preaching of this time somewhat as it did that of orthodoxism and Pietism, though the thought-world of the Bible retreated in favor of that of the philosophic-moralistic, while Biblical diction made way for the buoyant-poetic or ethical-learned. The chief weakness of the rationalistic pulpit lay in its content; its Christianity was diluted. Its commendation is that it advocated a fundamental and practical religion. Particulars to be noted are first the homiletic journals to which this period gave birth, such as the *Journal für Prediger* at Halle (1770 sqq.), Beyer's *Allegemeines Magozin für Prediger* (1789 sqq.), and Teller's *Neues Magazin für Prediger* (1792 sqq.). In the front rank of the individual preachers of the times stand Wilhelm Abraham Teller and Georg Joachim Zollikofer (qq.v.). A commanding personality was that of August Hermann Niemeyer (q.v.). There were also such pedants as Kindervater, Soldan, Snell, and Schuderoff, who preached on the basis of Kantian learning in a manner unintelligible to their congregations. Numerous preachers of the following of Teller turned to dry didactics; so Stolz in Bremen, Löffler in Gotha, Ribbeck in Magdeburg, and the productive Klefecker in Hamburg. Others employed more of pathos; so Hanstein, and Ehrenburg in Berlin. After the French Revolution the history of the church and of the times furnished much material for sermons. This was the case with the Swiss Johann Kaspar Häfeli (d. 1811) of Dessau, Bremen, and Bernburg. In his early career an opponent of the Enlightenment, later he came strongly under the influence of Kant; yet his talented control of language and masterful style revealed the born orator. Stolz, named above, preached on Frederick II., the freedom of the press, Zinzendorf, and the like; the pious supernaturalist Rosenmüller in Leipsic, on the noteworthy events of the eighteenth century. When Töllner proposed to preach on the revelation of God in nature, Köppen, the advocate of the Bible, protested. Such preachers abounded in city and hamlet. J. L. Ewald (d. 1822) issued sermons upon

nature (1781) and *Predigten über Naturtexte* (without a Biblical text; 1789 sqq.).

The result was a reaction against the dominant tendency from either an esthetic or a more Biblical standpoint. This reaction was the result of a deeper and stronger piety which had lived on among the people, to which were added the influences of a surviving supernaturalism. To this other factors contributed, such as the deeply grounded spiritual labors of a Johann Georg Hamann (q.v.), or the earnest piety, the dainty humor, and biting wit of Matthias Claudius (q.v.), or the power in prayer of a Johann Heinrich Jung Stilling (q.v.). Not to be overlooked in this movement were the results of the elevation and enriching due to the bloom of literature of the period, while the political conditions of the country made in the same direction. Of unusual significance, too, was Johann Gottfried Herder (q.v.), who is best compared with Baumgarten as an example of the classically instructed. The culture ideal of the humanists and the life ideal of Christianity were combined in his sermons. A large figure was that of Franz Volkmar Reinhard (q.v.); and related to him as exponent of supernaturalistic rationalism in carefully arranged and smoothly expressed sermons was Henry Gottlieb Tzschirner (q.v.), patriotic chaplain in the field, historian, and apologete. In German Switzerland this reaction was carried on from the Biblical standpoint by a series of original minds. Johann Tobler of Zurich (d. 1808) showed naïveté and originality in expression, and Evangelical earnestness. Especially noteworthy is Johann Caspar Lavater (q.v.), in his sermons as in his poetry preeminently appealing to the feelings. The text and its fundamental thought came to their own in his discourses, though somewhat overladen with emotion. Another Swiss, Johann Jakob Hess (q.v.), while in warmth, liveliness, and richness of thought behind Lavater, surpassed him in keenness of understanding, possession of historical sense, knowledge of Scripture, clearness of collocation of thought, and aptness of application. David Müslin of Bern (d. 1821) also strove against the tide of the Enlightenment, leaving eight volumes of sermons. A pious Evangelical sense, correct valuation of Scripture, surrender to the leading of the text, earnestness, clarity, and utility are the characteristics of his pulpit work. Karl Ulrich Stückelberger (d. 1816) of Basel stimulated the study of the Bible in sermons which showed a clear comprehension expressed didactically and leading to a surer knowledge.

4. The Reaction.

The effects of the earlier homiletic methods still continued to be felt throughout this period, and were followed by preachers who took a middle position between orthodoxy and Pietism. Thus in Basel worked the ardent Andreas Battier (d. 1793), who devoted himself to the Evangelical doctrine of salvation, and Nikolaus von Brunn, who labored with a fresh message for twenty years. In Württemberg preached Gottlieb Christian Storr (q.v.), Biblical but not fluent in type. Karl Friedrich Harttmann of Neuffen and Lauffen (d. 1815) ministered out of a rich fund of Evangelical instruction and religious experience. From Nuremberg came Johann Gottfried Schöner (d. 1822), poet and defender of the Bible, holding to the essential truths of the Gospel. His belief was that preaching would be effective if trust and salvation expressed externally the inward experience of the speaker. He was simple and clear in his arrangement of material and fluent in language. Not to be passed by is the unusually fertile work of G. E. Hartog in Löhne and Herford, Westphalia, marked by great clearness, comprehensiveness and intelligibility, strong and precise expression, intense earnestness, and rich practical application. The county of Tecklenburg produced such men as Johann Gerhard (q.v.), Friedrich Arnold, and Johann Heinrich Hasenkamp (q.v.). Original in force was the Lutheran founder of missions, Johann Jänicke (d. 1827), preacher at the Brethren's Church in Berlin.

5. The Mediating Pulpit.

In this period the waves which rolled on the German sea of thought beat also throughout Continental Europe. In Denmark Pietism found no advocate of first rank in the pulpit; it was represented only by translations from the German and found a stern opponent in Bishop Hersleb in Zealand, whose mighty eloquence contemporaries could not praise too highly. The sermons of Christian Bastholm (q.v.), distinguished for clear arrangement and brilliant diction and much admired by the cultured, revealed the principle that in theory and practise eloquence was a sumptuous dress to conceal poverty of thought. The foremost representative in Denmark of the rationalistic spirit was H. G. Clausen of Copenhagen (d. 1840), whose sermons are lucid and free from trivialities. Among Norwegians to be mentioned are Johan Nordahl Brun (d. 1816), bishop in Bergen, fiery in eloquence and poetic in gifts; he was an advocate of supernaturalism against rationalism, though not profound in thought; more friendly to rationalism were the discourses of Niels Stockfleth Schultz, preacher in Drontheim; and still more rationalistic was Claus Pavels (d. 1822), bishop in Bergen. Hans Nielsen Hauge (q.v.) had the Pietistic bent with a nomistic slant. In Sweden from 1700 to 1770 the prevailing preaching was a blend of the old orthodoxy with Pietism, but with a national coloring. The strong orthodox sermons of court preacher Andreas Nohrberg (d. 1767), though in form somewhat scholastic, are still used with great satisfaction by orthodox Pietists. Erik Tollstadius was a noble representative of the more mystic Pietism, and the few sermons which were printed are still much used. Peter Murbeck of Bleking (d. 1768) introduced more of the logical element, while the spirit of Herrnhut was exemplified in Carl Blutstrom (d. 1772) and Peter Hamburg. Among the bishops of the first half of the century worthy of mention as preachers were G. A. Humble of Wexio, a high-churchman; the second archbishop of Upsala S. Troilius, and Bishop J. Seranius of Strengnäs, both statesmen and men who introduced the State-Churchly idea into their sermons, as later did O. Wallqvist (d. 1800), and J. M. Fant (d. 1813). G. Enebom (d. 1796), belonging to the Enlightenment, introduced a period of Utilitarian moralism. From

6. Preaching Outside Germany.

1770 to 1809 virtue as the most serviceable thing was the theme of the sermons of J. Möller, B. von Gotland (d. 1805), C. Kullberg (d. 1808), and the neologian Bishop Lehnberg of Linköping (d. 1808). P. Fredell was an advocate of Swedenborgianism in opposition to the Enlightenment. In Holland in the second quarter of the nineteenth century no names of prominence stand out, and where the French language was spoken the same state of affairs existed. F J. Durand left *L'Année evangélique* in seven volumes (2d ed., Bern, 1780). Jean Frédéric Oberlin (q.v.) stands out as a true witness to the Gospel in an evil time, earnest and popular in his application of Scripture and life, illustrating his thoughts with instructing fulness. Antoine Court and Paul Rabaut (qq.v.) should be mentioned here, and J. Roget (q.v.). In Holland the sermon was influenced by the English school, and the style changed slowly from the older detailed exposition of the text to the synthetic method. The road in this country was broken by E. Hollebeek of Leyden, and P Chevalier of Groningen followed in discourses that were ethical and rationalistic in tone, as were those of E. Kist (d. 1822) in Dort. G. Bonnet of Utrecht (d. 1805) united the methods of the old and the new schools; the pious Jakob Hinlopen (d. 1803) for half a century protested by his method against all scholasticism, while L. Egeling in Leyden (d. 1835) was fruitful in his ministry. At the end of the eighteenth century examples of bombastic rhetoric appear in the sermons of J. Bosch and J. van Loo, while the reading of sermons began to be practised after the English model by the middle of that century.

5. The Evangelical Pulpit of the Nineteenth Century: The revival of church life which took place at the beginning of the nineteenth century found its reflection in preaching, which received new blood and quickening and in turn stimulated the common life. Among the influences which worked in this direction were the political conditions. The necessities of Germany during the Napoleonic period and its rebirth during the wars for freedom, resulting in a feeling of united life among the people, gave to the pulpit an aim and a definite direction. The two men most influential in this extended crisis were Schleiermacher and Draeseke, though they were supported by a host of preachers who with earnestness and courage and in noble spirit led the way. A further influence was the growing consciousness of a concrete Christianity in the piety of the times. While some preachers held to the old ways, the general trend was in the new direction, led by men like Draeseke and Theremin into a new form and to contents which attempted to realize a historical Christianity. Above all was the guidance of Schleiermacher, who made the person of Christ and the redemption central in his preaching. Immediately there developed a style of sermon suited to the movement of awakening, and the use of the Bible was no small part of the method employed, while a confessional interest was powerfully revived. As a whole the preaching of the first decades of the nineteenth century was essentially Christological. The general truths of reason are no longer in control, the Gospel rules. Meanwhile the text has come to its own as the constitutive element, while the dogmatic and confessional are in the foreground; the merely moral sermon has lost its reputation, the Evangelical takes its place.

1. Basal Influences.

Special importance attaches to Daniel Friedrich Schleiermacher (q.v.), who stands in the front rank of pulpit orators, as is attested by his ten volumes of sermons. His importance rests not alone in the fact that he influenced a generation of preachers and their sermons as did no other theologian of his century; but still more fundamental was his theological and homiletical starting-point in the immediateness of the emotions, to his steady retreat to the innermost Christian consciousness against the old supernaturalism, and also against the ruling rationalism and Kantianism. For him, the living sense of community with God is the center of Christian piety, and the stimulation of this is the purpose of all Christian preaching. His idea was to speak ever as to brethren and develop their Christian consciousness. Hence the chief content of his sermons is a clear exposition of his own inner life for believing Christians. The ethical was not neglected, but its sources were found in the religious consciousness. Characteristic was the way in which sin was treated by him, emphasizing the necessity of the new birth; he believed in a lifting above the situation where the flesh ruled rather than in a continuous conflict with a sinful inclination. In his earlier period he was closely tied to his text, which was generally short; as might be expected of so sturdy a thinker, the disposition of the thought was less formal than material. His preaching was wholly free from pathos, was classically tranquil in its thought development, closely logical in its articulation. Popular in the widest sense his sermons are not, adapted as they are for the cultured; but their clarity and logicalness make easy the understanding of them. He spoke often not simply as a Protestant preacher, but as a pious, experienced sage and moral philosopher. He did not write his sermons, but prepared them by most careful and painstaking meditation. The fact that one so learned in classical antiquity and in philosophy yet made Christ the central point and gave to ethical conceptions the cast of the New-Testament methods of viewing them was to many, tired of the old rationalistic preaching, not merely attractive but positively grateful. And long afterward the influence of his method was found among preachers who still regarded him as their model. New light has been cast in this direction by the publication by J. Bauer of Schleiermacher's *Ungedruckte Predigten aus 1820–28* (Leipsic, 1909), and Bauer's *Schleiermacher als patriotischer Prediger* (Giessen, 1908).

2. Schleiermacher.

His services were supported by a number of preachers of significant homiletical power. As advocates of a faith based on a Biblical revelation may be mentioned Gottfried Menken, Johann Baptist Albertini, and Johann Christian Gottlob Krafft (qq.v.), Theodore Lehmus of Ansbach (d. 1837), a victorious combatant of rationalism; Christian Adam Dann (q.v.), a preacher with suggestive themes and a diction juicy and forceful; Wilhelm

Hofacker (q.v.); and J. E. F. Sander (q.v.), careful in the exegesis of his text, rather learned than forceful. Also Biblical in his basis but concentrating his thought upon sin and grace was Ludwig Hofacker (q.v.). Preachers of another type were equally Biblical in their sphere of thought, but more confessional in their development. Such a man was Claus Harms (q.v.), a man of kindly, serene, and poetic sensibilities and fresh humor which made him acceptable to all classes. His originality lay in the plasticity of his diction and in richness and weight of thought. Pathos was sometimes unpleasantly abundant. His subjects were suggestive and catchy; while his arrangement is philosophical, it is not determined always by the text. He had numerous followers, of whom may be named here Martin Stephan and A. G. Rudelbach (qq.v.). Biblical and confessional in type were the two Krummachers, Gottfried Daniel and Friedrich Wilhelm (qq.v.). Of the latter it may be said that he was an artist in the use of words, supported by a tangible realism and an uncommonly lively power of construction, by which he was able to make real the characters of the Bible story. Yet in his word pictures he did not always adhere to the historically true. The New Testament was frequently read back into the Old, while his use of the typical and allegorical was rather excessive. In this group belong also Hermann Friedrich Kohlbrügge and the Reformed preacher Friedrich Ludwig Mallet (qq.v.). While between Claus Harms and Bernhard Draeseke (q.v.) certain connections existed, in general they are of different types. The latter's sermons can not be characterized accurately as prevailingly either Biblical or confessional; they were more general in type. Related to him in style was the important Bishop Ruhlemann Friedrich Eylert (q.v.), in whom buoyancy became extravagance and freshness unction. Other preachers, while supernatural in trend, were not of the narrow supernatural school; such were the Königsberg preacher Ludwig August Kähler (q.v.), and Heinrich Leonhard Heubner of Wittenberg (q.v.). Franz Theremin (q.v.) was akin to this group in the expression which he gave to his piety.

3. His School.

Another group may be designated as the stragglers of rationalistic preaching. Belonging here is the celebrated Christoph Friedrich von Ammon (q.v.). In his earlier sermons he appears as a Kantian moralist; in a later period he devoted himself to the exposition of ecclesiastical doctrine. Finally, in his third period he returned to practically his first position. Gifted in the matter of form, diplomatically clever in expression, of courtly fluency, and often of lofty and witty flow of thought, his sermons were especially adapted to the educated. The most important representative of the popular rationalism in these times was Johann Friedrich Röhr (q.v.). In clarity and logical coordination he followed Reinhard. In general his sermons escape many of the inherent weaknesses of the rationalistic discourse, though the basis is thoroughly rationalistic. Here belongs also Moritz Ferdinand Schmalz (d. 1860), who served pastorates in Vienna, Dresden, and Hamburg; prolific and lively in thought, he recalled Reinhard in the careful and often comprehensive disposition of his material. Of like prominence were the Hamburg pastors J. K. W. Alt and C. U. A. Krause.

4. Remainders of Rationalism.

The decades after the wars for freedom, in which on one side rationalism was one of the forces and on the other the influence of Schleiermacher and of the awakening was potent, constitute a period of ferment for the pulpit. Strong individualists like those already described broke away from the rationalistic, emotional-judicious, stirring-pathetic method, and a type gained the ascendency corresponding to the new influences. The result was not unlike that produced by Schleiermacher, though the resemblance was not due to dialectic trenchancy nor to depth of thought. The new preaching became often a preaching of repentance under the stimulus of the emphasis upon the significance of Christ for salvation. But the fine lines of Schleiermacher's dialectic, due to his dogmatic system, were hidden behind the grosser outlines of ecclesiastical confessions. In sum the new preaching was a return to Christ and the Bible. Hence the relation of the sermon to the text was recast. Rationalism formally allowed the authority of the Bible, but interpreted as it chose. The new understanding of Christianity caused the employment of the text in its original meaning as the guiding principle of the sermon. Of course traces of the earlier usage remained here and there, and the Word was sometimes misconstrued, especially the Old Testament, into which the New Testament was read. But the pulpit was essentially Biblical, the pericopes retained their importance, although the use of free texts was not unknown, while sometimes whole books of the Bible were the occasion of courses of sermons. The diction of the sermon was also influenced by that of the Bible, sometimes so strongly as to have an archaic sound. Similarly, the content of the sermon underwent change. Rationalism had chosen ethical themes, and these fell into discredit. Religious or religious-dogmatic themes were the rule, with a polemic against rationalism, the Friends of Light, liberalism, the new theology, and especially against the unchristian spirit of the times. Standard themes, of course with infinite variation, were repentance, grace, judgment, the person of Christ, the atonement. Consequently there was danger of the sermon becoming stereotyped. The way in which text and sermon contents were bound together was controlled by the ruling analytic-synthetic method. The text furnished the chief suggestions or themes; the thoughts furnished by the analysis of the text were united in a theme and then put in order according to the divisions, and these latter were prevailingly threefold—more than four divisions are rare. The length of the sermon gradually became shorter, from thirty to forty minutes. Here and there other than a Biblical text was chosen, while catechetical sermons were not unknown, as were those on the Apostles' Creed.

5. A New Trend.

A considerable proportion of pulpit orators laid emphasis upon Christ and Scripture, after the forms

of the Lutheran confessions, and were at no pains to disguise this spirit of confessional energy and dogmatic stress. The cardinal doctrines of the person of Christ, of sin and grace, and of the atonement ruled the sermon; and along with the positive exposition of these themes there was a polemic against errant tendencies of the period. The endeavor was to have the sermon practical with reference to the center of the Gospel. Among the exponents of this spirit of the pulpit may be named from South Germany Johann Konrad Wilhelm Löhe, Gottlieb Christian Adolf von Harless, and Gottfried Thomasius (qq.v.); from North Germany especially Ludwig Harms (q.v.), Ludwig Adolf Petri, and K. K. Münkel (qq.v.). Petri's sermons were simple in construction, but so deep and rich in their thought that they were adapted rather for the educated. The text governed in the working-out of his discourses, and was often exegetically treated. He emphasized doctrine without obscuring the Gospel, and revealed an earnest, keen, thoroughly trained personality of the Lutheran-confessional type. Münkel, while stressing less the form, exercised a like care in the working-out of his discourses and in their clearness. He preached to the church of a village, and that influenced his diction and his illustrations; the result is that his sermons may be designated as popular. He avoids all that is coarse; he is learned, the church standards define his exposition, and his exegesis is unadorned. In this connection Bernhard Adolph Langbein of Saxony should be mentioned. From Christian Ernst Luthardt's pen have come down a number of volumes of sermons which unite a full utilization of the text with determination of its religious testimony. Simple and forceful repose combines with a great active ethical strength and rich theological content. Gerard Uhlhorn (q.v.) had a remarkable gift of exposition, and vigorous material found a corresponding form of expression, while a mighty ethical earnestness was combined with the energy of the Lutheran proclamation. Of Lutherans outside of Germany mention may be made of A. F. Huhn, preacher at Reval, prolific in production.

6. The Confessional Type.

From this group of distinctively confessional preachers a second group may be distinguished by a closer grip of the confessional element and a sharper emphasis upon practical, communal, and individual matters. To be named here are Karl Heinrich Caspari of Munich and J. F. Ahlfeld (q.v.) in Leipsic. The sermons of the former in their simplicity appeal more to the ordinary man than to the educated; but they show a rich experience, a deep knowledge of men, special aptitude in individualization, concrete illustrations, and a plastic exposition. Johann Friedrich Ahlfeld was too practically disposed to be a mere partizan. In the many volumes of sermons from his pen there are shown an engaging warmth, a religious-ethical earnestness, and an extraordinary power of presentation combined with popular homeliness. The Württemberg Church produced Wilhelm Hoffmann (q.v.), a preacher whose discourses lead clearly and surely into the Scriptures and their plan of salvation and illuminate the practical life. Another man of note is B. B. Brückner (q.v.), preacher in Berlin and professor in Leipsic, a man of gentle orthodoxy, pleasing speech, fine employment of the text, and correct in his methods of arrangement. Of Carl Gerok (q.v.) it may be said that he possessed a great power of pleasing, a gentle mildness, a pronounced clarity, a poetic beauty, none of which lessened the earnest depth of his Christian thought and comprehension of the text. He was, however, more of a practical man than thinker, partaking of the qualities of Ahlfeld as a saver of souls. Also to be named are the brothers Max and Emil Frommel, the former of whom belonged to the group of practical sermonizers who based their work on the Bible. Max's sermons may be said to be more forceful and earnest than his brother's, and carry a tinge of Pietism with a joyous and certain faith in God. They are artistically complete. Emil, court preacher and military chaplain at Berlin, especially in his sermons on festival days took great delight in leading his congregation into the world of Biblical thought; he also was practical in type, polished to a degree. Events, history, application, interpretation, illustration, followed each other throughout his discourses. He was a preacher for all ranks of society, though the fineness of his discourse made him appreciated most by the cultured. Two preachers of recent date are Rudolph Kögel and Heinrich Hoffmann (qq.v.). The former, in dogmatics stronger than Frommel, did not strive for dogmatic profundity; his forte was a rhetorical art which made all else serviceable. Hoffmann's strength lay in his fine, searching, saving, and keen psychology, in the energetic compactness with which he brought to expression his rich and deep thinking, in the forcefulness of the testimony which he brought to the Gospel, and finally in the holy earnestness with which he appealed to the conscience. T. J. R. Kögel (q.v.), preacher at the cathedral in Berlin, was the foremost Evangelical clergyman in Prussia, possessed of great national and courtly opportunities, a prince in the pulpit, the rhetorician of sacred oratory, a master of style; on the other side was Heinrich Hoffmann, restricted to the narrow sphere of the Neumarktkirche in Halle, without notoriety, yet a herald of earnest and philosophical thought, a real shepherd of souls. Both of them were preachers to the educated; for simple people the genius of Kögel was too lofty, the compressed thought of Hoffmann too difficult of comprehension. Neither had the fine, light touch of Emil Frommel, the gripping power of narration of Ahlfeld, or the gentle art of Gerok. Only briefly to be mentioned here are Johann Friedrich Wilhelm Arndt (q.v.), the Berlin preacher Strauss, whose sermons are distinguished by devoutness and feeling, and Karl Büchsel (q.v.), whose rough, formless, knotty, but uncommonly earnest and practical sermons had wide influence. The sermons of F L. Steinmeyer (q.v.) might be called essays toward the understanding of Scripture. The material for them he derived from the text, while the exegesis was almost too broad and artistic; but the thoughts were ever deep and original, the structure well thought through, the form beautiful

7. Emphasis on the Practical.

and connected, and the aim was to produce religion, not theology.

8. Pietistic Antirationalistic Preaching.

A third group show either Pietistic or Scripturalistic influences. They are pronouncedly antirationalistic, and reveal the sharp ecclesiastical tendency. They are preachers of repentance, or salvation, or awakening, or conscience, but never, in the pulpit, theologians. They have little to do with exegesis and offer their own witness. They seldom speak as the mouth of the congregation, though they are the more successful as Evangelists. They regard little the arrangement of the discourse, at any rate the formal carrying-out of a plan and the formulation of subject and divisions. A peculiar position in this group was gained by Johann Tobias Beck (q.v.), who was Scripturalistic. Other men of Württemberg to be named are Sixt Karl Kapff and Johann Christoph Blumhardt (qq.v.). The latter was mighty as a preacher, and often opened wide the treasure of knowledge and experience hidden in the Scriptures. His sermons rang true, and he was smooth yet popular in his diction. Here should be named a German Swiss who belonged to the speculative division of the school of Bengel and Oetinger, the original and spirited David Spleiss of Schaffhausen (d. 1854), who traced the inner unity of nature and Scripture. In his earnestness he used mouth, hand, and foot in the pulpit in order to give expression to the press of thought, was impressive, fiery, clear, suggestive, yet always popular. His discourses were uncommonly full and connected. From the Prussian rural church came August Tholuck (q.v.), whose Pietistic coloring was toned down by his academic activity. His idea of the sermon was that it should not be a demonstration of man's intelligence but a testimony of the divine Spirit. His discourses owe their force especially to the masterful psychological development of a deep and binding apologetics, sharpening the conscience. The noble, cultured, and impressive diction is inspired with the warmest feeling and the deepest earnestness, while the exposition is lightened with the play of a lively but sanctified imagination. He was free in the matter of form, in the method of handling his text, even in the choice of a text, not restricting himself to Scripture but using, e.g., passages from the Augsburg Confession. Purely a Pietist was Gustav Knak (d. 1878), especially successful in his appeal to the heart and emotions of the congregation, and possibly the most sensitive and appealing of all the preachers of the nineteenth century.

9. Individualism Dominant.

A fourth group is composed of those who first set forth Christian verity in an external garb drawn not so much from the Bible as from the individuality of the preacher; they also show a desire to rub off many corners and edges of Biblical pronouncements, thus to present Christian doctrine in a milder form and one more in accord with the characteristics of the times. Preachers of this type of academical theologians are especially numerous, and particularly those who belong to the mediating theology. It is not strange that among many of these the thoughtful working-out of the verities of faith seemed more important than immediate influence upon heart and conscience, and one might even assign Tholuck to this group, though in him the pietistic-Biblical element preponderated. This last was not the case with Karl Immanuel Nitzsch (q.v.), whose sermons, like Schleiermacher's, showed a complete blending of the religious and the ethical; he also laid little stress upon form and diction. The deep inner harmony of his being, grounded in a fully ripened completion of his philosophical, theological, and practical ecclesiastical views, the imperturbable peace, and the conciliatory character of his mind were mirrored forth in his preaching. Julius Müller (q.v.) showed in his preaching an argumentative exposition of Scripture and a learned and dialectic development which required sympathy of energy in the hearer or reader. The sermons of Richard Rothe (q.v.) were such as could spring only from his own singularly deep and cultured nature; what he uttered was wholly his own, in speech and in flow of thought entirely individual. Externally his sermons present a finished oratorical and artistic form. Karl Theodor Albert Liebner and Friedrich August Eduard Ehrenfeuchter (qq.v.) belong to this group, as do Albrecht Wolters, remarkable for poetically beautiful and thoughtfully fine testimony, and Willibald Beyschlag (qq.v.), a brilliant preacher of fine sensibilities, who employed a mild apologetics to the reconciliation of Christianity and modern culture. He was a witness for Evangelical Christianity with great freedom of spirit and constraint of conscience, a noted exegete, uniting the thought of the text with individual comprehension and elaboration. Here also must be placed Julius Müllensiefen (q.v.), though his sermons reproduce more faithfully than those just mentioned the Biblical coloring; he is also much more popular, deeper mentally, and richer in feeling than many of them.

10. Modernistic Group.

The fifth group includes within its numbers preachers with wide differences; they share with the preceding independence in the form of thought and of construction, and they speak not in the language of the Bible but in that of the times. The general attitude is that of Carl Schwarz: "Not only is the present born again through the spirit of Christianity, but Christianity itself is born again through the present." It is not the old rationalism which comes out in this group, however; all in which that form of thought failed, religion, in which lie the depths of the soul's life, is that which these preachers would supply on the basis of the incarnation of Christ, real and effective, and no less on the basis of the entire and complete humanizing of Christianity. Of this group Carl Schwarz (q.v.), cited above, is the leader and chief representative. His idea was to make use of whatever had been critically established by Lessing, Herder, Schleiermacher, and Hegel, and to make it available to the congregation. He translated Christianity, formally as well as essentially, into German in sermons which were religious-ethical. Christ was not pushed into the background, though the presentation of him was of a sort other than that of the Biblically based church doctrine. His sermons might be described as highly idealistic, rhetorically forceful, warmly religious,

ethically earnest, in their conception of life free. Of another type, yet in many respects related to Schwarz, is the worthy Albert Bitzius of Switzerland, who spoke out openly and frankly, perhaps even more plainly than Schwarz, his dissent from the earlier church doctrine. Schwarz was in his homiletical art a pure idealist; Bitzius was as emphatically a realist; where Schwarz is all buoyancy and inspiration, Bitzius is reality, fact. But the latter is never dull or dry, the expression is forceful, comprehensively and yet simply beautiful. As a result the matters treated are intimately joined with his subject. He does not deal with generalities, but handles many special themes from common life and from other spheres. It follows that for him the text can not have the upper hand; his sermons are never analytical; they deal with the material furnished by his congregation in a serious, essentially religious, ethical, and vigorous manner. Ethical sermons, in the strict sense of the phrase, he never delivers; yet he feels his connection with the faith of Christians of all periods, and he urges his hearers each to have a faith which is individually his very own. If any of the preachers of the nineteenth century is practical, then is Bitzius practical. The fresh, picturesque, and inspired sermons of the Swiss Heinrich Lang (q.v.) differ from the discourses of Bitzius in that they do not follow of purpose a set ethical-religious aim; they set relentlessly before the hearers his own free religious position and woo those hearers to adopt them. Daniel Schwenkel, Carl Weizsäcker, and Alexander Schweizer (q.v.) should be in this group.

6. The Recent German Pulpit: In this section only a survey can be afforded of the prolific product of the pulpit. The first and the second groups of the last period find their continuance in this period. The general tendency is to make the dogmatic retreat before the practical. Following the first group as given above are Wilhelm Walther of Rostock and Theodor Zahn (qq.v.) of Erlangen. Affiliated with the second group, strongly represented, are O. Pank in Leipsic, producing thoughtful and forceful discourses; Paul Kaiser of the same city, noted for smooth diction, clear construction, easy comprehensiveness, and living conceptions; E. Quandt, who has produced several volumes of sermons; Hermann Cremer (q.v.), who stresses the grace of God in Christ to sinful man; and Adolf Schlatter, a Swiss, whose activities are displayed in Tübingen. These all intend to preach the "old Gospel" in the sense of the doctrine of the Church; they are opposed to the modern tendency and polemize against the emptying of the Gospel by theologians of liberal spirit as against positive tendencies against Christianity. They notice little the questions and doubts urged by modern skepticism; they start with the trustworthiness of the Bible, appeal to experience for confirmation, and address wholly the flock as standing on the old faith. They are in part, therefore, masters of form; they know how to use the text practically and to apply it to the inner religious life. The fourth group described in the foregoing is also represented in the latest period, though not without characteristic deviations. Ernst Dryander (q.v.) of Berlin may be set in this group. One of his dicta is: "We are accustomed to say and to believe that the Gospel is akin to all that is great and noble in man." He is noted for his fine culture, for the eloquent though unrhetorical control of form, for religious fervor, and for depth of Biblical feeling. The school of Nitzsch is continued by a number of preachers mostly in academic positions, though the tendency of these in their theological conceptions is conservatively mediating, not without influence. Such are Erich Haupt of Halle (q.v.), possessing an extraordinary exegetical keenness, a thrilling force of thoughtful development, and a deep fervor; Gustav Kawerau (q.v.), who seeks to move men through the holy earnestness, the depth and strength of God's word alone; Julius Kaftan (q.v.); Ernst Christian Achelis (q.v.) of Marburg; and Wilhelm Faber of Berlin, who recalls Kögel in his rhetorical form. They preach the old Gospel for the modern comprehension and adapt it to present conditions, of which they have a deep apprehension.

1. Emphasis on the Practical.

Yet those who have been named differ widely from each other, and the line between them and those of a freer tendency or of the right wing is tenuous. To the right wing belong those preachers who in the matter of the sermon sharply separate theology and religion, assigning the debated questions of religious knowledge to theology and reserving matters of religious influence for the popular ear. Men of this tendency were particularly under the guidance of Albrecht Ritschl, and include such names as Kaftan (ut sup.), B. W. Bornemann, Hermann Schultz, Paul Drews, J. Gottschick, Theodor Häring, and Friedrich Loofs (qq.v.). A somewhat freer theological position is taken by preachers like Otto Baumgarten (q.v.), Erich Förster, and H. Hackmann. Between this group and the left wing of the freer theology stands the distinction that the latter in the sermon take up expressly the contest with the traditional apprehension of Christian knowledge, but of course with individual differences of method and viewpoint. Thus there are Heinrich Holtzmann (q.v.) of Strasburg, spiritual, thoughtful, and deep-reaching in exegesis and reflection; P. Kirmss and W. Bahnsen, and Heinrich Ziegler, an idealist of the type of Carl Schwarz; and the two Bremen preachers A. Kalthoff and Moritz Schwalb. There is another strain as yet uncharacterized. The idealistic tendency of Schwarz had its counterpart in the realistic lines of Bitzius; the abstract-religious or general-ethical implies a special-concrete opposite, in which the text is less directive in the sermon than the definite situation of the congregation. As Drew puts it: "It has come forcibly to our apprehension that each community has its individuality, and that to each in its appropriate method the Gospel is to be adapted." Special circumstances are to be handled to the profit of the congregation, chief among which are problems arising in social conditions. Among preachers who take cognizance of matters social Friedrich Naumann has especial prominence by reason of his masterly grip and clear handling of the

2. A Composite Group.

fundamental problems of the present, including those in the ethical and religious worlds. While his solutions are perhaps never fully satisfying from a theoretical standpoint, they show a marvelously clear and practical piety. He conceives his message to be "to those who in the midst of the life of the new age would find a personal relation to Christianity," and to these he speaks in their own tongue, starting with them as a sharer in their own conception of things, yet by reason of the strength of his faith is their leader. A preacher of the type of Naumann is Bernhard Doerries; in his concreteness and aptness of dealing with affairs of the congregation and individual he reproduces Naumann at his best. Here belong also Geyer and Rittelmeyer of Nuremberg, with their excellent modern fresh and plastic methods. Gustav Frenssen does not always preach real village sermons; but he does not take fright at any particular circumstances. Yet the thinking auditor finds something lacking in his work; he gives religious conceptions without theological insight; he is an apologete for Christianity, but above all as a preacher he is a poet. Very concrete and suited for a rural people are the discourses which H. Kaiser has collected, as well as the addresses of Erwin Gros. K. Hesselbacher, now at Carlsruhe, has established a firm reputation as village preacher. The descendants of the third group named above have experienced also great changes. The Pietistic-emotional sermon suits no longer the taste of the Methodist-revivalistic hearer. The modern sermon of Evangelization has many types, from the one-sided and fanatical works of Karl Idel to the more restful ones of J. Stockmeyer, the psychologically fine and many-sided ones of Elias Schrenk, and the energetic, rousing, apologetic, and modern discourses of Samuel Keller. But all these claim the right to be distinguished from those who use the stormy, impetuous, and nerve-racking methods so largely dominant, even while they receive their impulse toward the "Field-Mission" from the very decided movement manifested among the different congregations. Whether the Methodistic flavor of these sermons is great, less, or very little, whether they are prevailingly Biblical or modern and practical, their aim is conversion, their object is decision, and their method is a rousing call to repentance. The modern pulpit has certain well-marked characteristics. It appeals to the soul life of the hearer with firm grip and full understanding; it is religious and practical and ill-disposed to dogmatics, realizes the logic of necessity in requiring a solution of the problems of the times.

7. The Continental Pulpit Outside Germany:

1. In Scandinavia.

For Denmark the first name worthy of mention is that of Jakob Peter Mynster (q.v.), bishop of Zealand, simple but noble in diction and deep in thought. Not simply a preacher but also a religious author, the prophet of the inner life and the opponent of ecclesiastical Christianity was Sören Aabye Kierkegaard (q.v.). Mynster's successor, Hans Lassen Martensen (q.v.), with all his versatility in the study of the text and its application, yet many a time misses a really enchaining style. Nikolai Frederik Severin Grundtvig (q.v.) was a preacher of really original power. With the early strength of his polemic against rationalism, somewhat decayed, there remained the undauntedness of his living testimony, resting upon his inner experience, against a declension of faith in the Father, the fire of his temperament, and above all his popular, poetic, blazing eloquence. His great influence was seen in such men as W. Birkedal and C. Hostrup. D. G. Monrad had a keen eye for the psychological approach and great ability in delineation of character. N. G. Blaedel, R. Frimodt, H. H. Paulli (d. 1865), Wilhelm Beck (d. 1901), are names meriting mention. Living Danish preachers of eminence are T. S. Roerdam (q.v.), bishop of Zealand, a pupil of Grundtvig, J. Paulli, son of H. H. Paulli, and H. B. Ussing (q.v.). It may be said in passing that the prevailing usage in Denmark is against the use of manuscript in the pulpit. In Norway, Willem Andreas Wexels won great renown both as an eminent preacher and as a distinguished foe of rationalism. O. Andreas Berg (d. 1861) was entirely orthodox in his short, penetrating, clear and practical sermons, but after the Norwegian method which combined Lutheran orthodoxy with Pietism. Somewhat similar in character was Honoratus Halling, and the still living G. Jensen of Christiania shows the influence of Grundtvig and Lutheran orthodoxy. In the most recent years a more "modern" spirit has invaded, closely akin to that of Germany. It has been recognized as a function of the pulpit to meet the modern educated man with a warm-hearted understanding and to win him for Christianity and the Church. A noted exponent of this tendency is T. Klaveness of Christiania. In Sweden also there set in early in the nineteenth century a current against rationalism, in the form of a strong confessional Lutheranism combined with a strong Pietistic movement among the laity. The sermons are of the synthetic type, but for the chief service of the day the pericopes furnish the text, for other services the choice of text is free; the reading of the sermon is more frequent than in Norway and Denmark, at least in the established Church, indeed many bishops expressly recommend that form. In the antirationalistic campaign a leading influence was that of Professor Samuel Oedmann of Upsala (d. 1829) and C. P. Hagberg of Lund (d. 1837), who led also in the changes in sermon form. In the following period in the Established Church three groups appeared. Those who were under the influence of romanticism opposed rationalism as an empty religion of reason and approximated closely to Lutheran doctrine as the expression of their convictions. This class was represented by a series of poetically endowed men of very different qualities, such as the celebrated poet of the Frithiofs Saga, Esaias Tegnér (d. 1846), the childlike and lovable Bishop Franz Mikael Franzén (d. 1847), and Johann Olof Wallin (d. 1839), who in catchy diction, roundness of expression, beauty of rhythm, and perspicuity of arrangement was unexcelled in Sweden. In a second group are to be placed C. G. Rogberg of Upsala (d. 1842), whose sermons showed great beauty of form, in the early period a liking for the Enlightenment, later a better agreement with Christian doctrine; Johan Henrik Thomander (d. 1865), called

by his friends "the new Luther," was extemporaneous in style, with an uncommon freshness of presentation; and Anton Niklas Sundberg (d. 1900), a mighty personality. All these had a broad outlook, but especially emphasized freedom in the pulpit. A third and somewhat larger group were in control in the second half of the century, and advocated a strong orthodox Lutheranism. The pathbreaker was Henrik Schartau (q.v.), with his passionate zeal for pure doctrine, who founded a homiletical school which is yet influential in the south and west of Sweden. He was full of Evangelical zeal as a saver of souls, though no Pietist, in his sermons full of thought, psychologically fruitful, with a mystical depth of content and of spiritual experience, carefully exegetical not only of the text but of the context. With him stood E. C. Bring (d. 1884), bishop in Linköping, and J. C. Bring, director of the deaconess institute in Stockholm. Revivalist in type was Levi Lastadius (d. 1861), while a Methodistic preacher was the layman Karl Olof Rosenius (d. 1868), who emphasized free grace. Of more recent preachers the bishop of Lund, G. Billing, is worthy of mention.

The preachers of German Switzerland followed the lead of Bitzius and H. Lang (ut sup.); and of contributors to the literature of preaching there are Konrad W K. Kambli, A. Hauri, A. Bolliger, and B. Riggenbach. G. Benz, in Basel, and R. Aeschbacher have sprung in recent years into wide fame as preachers. In French Switzerland men of prominence were François Samuel Robert Louis Gaussen, Paul Ami Isaac David Bost, Solomon Cæsar Malan, and Jean Henri Merle d'Aubigné (qq.v.). These were all of the revivalistic type of pulpit orators. Of a totally different kind was the preaching of Alexander Rodolphe Vinet (q.v.), in which emotion is suppressed in favor of dialectically sharp thought which requires the close attention of the reader. While the text is in the background, definite themes are marshalled in masterly fashion, with deep comprehension of what is essential and with religious warmth. His illustrations are from history, nature, and life rather than the Bible; and he rests upon a clear comprehension of the essence and needs of the soul, of its relationship to time and the world, and of its search for freedom and God. Here should be mentioned Frank Coulin (q.v.).

2. The German-Swiss Pulpit.

In France, out of the circles which were in relations with the Swiss revivalistic school sprang Adolphe Monod (q.v.), possibly the first French preacher of the century; his brother Frédéric (q.v.) is of less prominence. In the first rank stand Grandpierre and Eugéne Artur François Bersier (q.v.). While these orthodox representatives are noted, it would be unfair to omit mention of such followers of a freer method as Athanase Coquerel, father and son (qq.v.). The former was guided by the earlier French liberalism, quietly moderate in tone; and the polish extended beyond the rich and full flow of thought, the clear, incisive language, to the gesture and pose, to the dignity of the very man himself. The son was a leader of the freer Protestantism in France, a genial and versatile personality. His sermons were greatly valued for their religious force and penetration, with which he united simplicity and elegance. With these men Ferdinand Fontanes should also be named. In Holland the sermons of the first half of the century were essentially practical. Meriting first place is E. A. Borger (d. 1820), brilliant and original, still studied. The court preacher at The Hague, J. J. Dermout (d. 1867), was called the Napoleon of the pulpit because of the imperative force of his discourses. H. H. van der Palm (q.v.) was celebrated as an expounder of Scripture, and was known as *doctor mellifluus* for the elegance of his style. Among those who adorned the pulpit of the Remonstrants were Amorie van der Hoeven, father (d. 1855) and son (d. 1848), the first of whom, a polished speaker, issued a study of the eloquence of Chrysostom, while the son was even more fundamental in thought than the father. Others of eminence were J. J. van Oosterzee (q.v.), J. I. Doedes (q.v.) of Rotterdam, J. P. Hasebroek of Amsterdam, and J. J. L. ten Kate of Middleburg; while of recent date is C. E. van Koetsveld. In Holland alongside of the orthodox Calvinistic pulpit, then, goes a strong tendency toward the free and modern style.

3. In France and Holland.

8. The Roman Catholic Pulpit: In Germany only very slowly did the Roman Catholic pulpit work itself free from formlessness and unimportance into the respectability which it reached in the nineteenth century as illustrated, for example, by the work of Johann Michael von Sailer. The influence of the blooming German literature affected the Roman Catholic pulpit later than it did the Lutheran. Even the brilliant orators of the French Roman Catholic pulpit failed to affect their coreligionists in Germany as much as they did those of Italy. In the same way the philosophic and rationalistic stream was later in making its way into Roman Catholicism than into Protestantism; but the return to an ecclesiastical orthodoxy was achieved contemporaneously with the same movement in the Protestant pulpit. The value of the Church, the papacy, and its holy treasure, the veneration of the saints, above all of the mother of God, were the principal themes, but treated in a more modern way. This is true of the first decades of the nineteenth century, where preaching obtained. In the last half of the century three phases are to be discriminated. One was rooted in dogmatics, the second was under the influence of rationalistic philosophy and the Enlightenment, the third was a return to the ultramontanistic spirit. At the beginning of the eighteenth century many preachers mingled with their discourses quotations from the Church Fathers, so that in some cases the discourses were half Latin. Exponents of this mixed style are the Benedictine Placidus Urtlauff, the Augustinian Samuel Depfer of Vienna, and the Benedictine Sebastian Textor. Others delivered a course of sermons dealing with morals, sometimes covering a considerable period; so the Capuchin Jordan Annaniensis and the Carmelite Pacificus a Cruce. Preaching was at a low ebb, men did not learn from the great patterns; hence the flatness of the work of Xaver Dorn, Maximin Steger, Joseph

1. Early Characteristics.

Angelus a St. Claudia, whose diction and figures belong to the seventeenth century. Still there were prophecies of better things to come as in the discourses of Hermann Schlosser, who with approach to better form united an uncommon knowledge of Scripture. Anti-Protestant polemics characterized the sermons of Franz Neumayr of Augsburg, and of Alois Merx (d. 1792); a much finer diction was employed by Ignaz Wurz of Vienna (d. 1784), as well as an excellent style and material full of substance. The influence of the Enlightenment was seen in B. Bolzano (d. 1848), B. M. von Werkmeister, and the Franciscan Eulogius Schneider (d. 1794). A. Selmar represented a utilitarian tendency. One of the noblest figures of the Roman Catholic pulpit was Johann Michael von Sailer (q.v.), pious, gentle, and broad, whose theory of preaching was that it was not the duty of the preacher merely to stimulate to performance of duty, but he was to furnish sustenance to the hungry soul. He displayed great clearness, versatile exposition, a wealth of deep and often flashing thought, a deep veneration of God, warm love for man, and a corresponding charitable peace of soul. With Sailer stood a group of men who might be called his school, in some of whom the universality of Christianity was emphasized against the Roman Catholicism of others. Of these may be mentioned Michael Nathanael Feneberg (q.v.), who preached a faith made fruitful in good works; Xavier Bayr, and the highly endowed Langenmayr of Augsburg; and the praiseworthy Christoph von Schmid (d. 1854), the writer for young people. In the bishopric of Augsburg alone were sixty priests with this tendency. Much assailed because of his preaching of righteousness through faith was Martin Boos (q.v.); Ignaz Lindl was one of the most popular preachers of his day, and was called to St. Petersburg, where he preached long in brilliant and inspired style, sermons somewhat ecstatic in method and content, as well as chiliastic in tone, which brought finally his separation and building of an independent congregation. Johannes Evangelista Gossner (q.v.) preached in Munich the Gospel of "Christ in us and for us," a really Evangelical preacher in the fold of the Roman Catholic Church, from which he finally went out, and numerous collections of his sermons attest the real value of his pulpit work. Aloys Henhöfer and Charles Paschal Telesphore Chiniquy (qq.v.) are to be named here, as well as J. H. Wichern (q.v.).

Apart from this Evangelical movement are to be remembered such pulpit orators as G. A. Dietl of Landshut (d. 1809), savory in illustration and expression; and the independent and suggestive T. A. Dereser (d. 1827), court preacher at Carlsruhe and professor in Lucerne and Breslau. Still more significant from the standpoint of the pulpit was the convert from Judaism Johann Emil Veith, author of works on medical science and in belles lettres as well as in homiletics. His sermons are rhetorical in style, natural, clear, richly illustrated from history, picturesque, with an infusion of versatile polemics, and normal in arrangement. With him are to be recalled men like Melchior Freiherr von Diepenbrock (q.v.), Johannes von Geissel (d. 1864), Joseph Othmar von Raucher (d. 1875), archbishop of Vienna, Prince-bishop Heinrich von Förster of Breslau (d. 1881), Franz Xaver Dieringer (d. 1876), professor at Bonn. In France about the middle of the nineteenth century a brilliant figure was Jean Baptiste Henri Lacordaire (q.v.), while Père Hyacinthe (Loyson, q.v.) later left the Roman Catholic fold. The Roman Catholic pulpit of the present has an essentially ecclesiastical-missionary character, emphasizing not the doctrines of sin and the free grace of God, but the Church as an institution of salvation, and obedience to her commands. Scripture as furnishing the text has a much looser connection with the sermon than in the Evangelical pulpit, and the sermon itself is shallower. Of course there are not wanting sermons which fathom deeply Christian verity, but this type is rather exceptional. The general method is practical and popular, stressing the ecclesiastical, not avoiding reference to the saints and their legends. This has its advantages from the standpoint of people to whom thinking is unusual, but it reveals the general weakness of the Roman Catholic pulpit. (M. Schian.)

2. Later Tendencies.

IV. Preaching in the English Tongue.—1. Before the Reformation: Traces of the beginnings of preaching in Anglo-Saxon are found in Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica*. Through the preaching of Paulinus in the year 625 "the nation of the Northumbrians, that is, the nation of the Angles," received Christianity. Further, Paulinus of York (q.v.) labored "to convert some of the pagans to a state of grace by his preaching." Thus it would appear that he addressed them either directly or through an interpreter in their own tongue. This work was not enduring, but later (in 633) King Oswald wished to bring the Northumbrian Angles back to the faith, and sent to the Scots for a preacher. Aidan (q.v.) was dispatched from Iona, and his ministry was highly successful. He preached through interpreters. One charming story relates that "when the bishop, who was not skillful in the English tongue, preached the gospel, it was most delightful to see the king himself interpreting the word of God to his commanders and ministers." Others of the Saxon kingdoms received the word through preaching. Among the preachers to the common people was Saint Cuthbert (q.v.), who is described as a "skilful orator," who delighted to go to obscure places for weeks at a time and "allure that rustic people by his preaching and example to heavenly employments." Bede himself reports in Latin a number of monkish sermons, of more or less doubtful authenticity. Bede also preached to the people in their own tongue, and tradition reports that his word was with power. From the eighth century on there was much preaching by English monks in the vernacular, and there are a number of Saxon homilies dating from both before and after the Norman Conquest in 1066. One of the homilists was Wulfstan (q.v.), archbishop of York (d. 1023). Of him Professor Earle says (*English Prose*, p. 383, London, 1890), "Of all the writers before the Conquest whose names are known to us, Wulfstan is the one whose diction has the most marked physiognomy." There is also a collection of translations

1. The Anglo-Saxon Period.

from the Latin into Saxon which bears the name of Aelfric (see ALFRIC) and dates from early in the eleventh century.

2. The Norman Period.

After the Norman Conquest there are no traces of preaching to the invaders in their own language; though there are Latin sermons from this period. To the English people themselves, however, there was preaching in their own tongue. Many Anglo-Saxon homilies from this time are extant. From the twelfth and thirteenth centuries comes the highly valuable collection of Morris, *Old English Homilies*, which contains many interesting specimens of the English preaching of that epoch. During this period at least four notable prelates are also entitled to notice as preachers. These are: Ailred of Revesby (q.v.), Peter of Blois (q.v.), who, though a Frenchman, learned the English tongue and preached in it; Stephen Langton (q.v.), the celebrated archbishop of York, in his earlier years a preacher of distinction; and the famous bishop of Lincoln, Robert Grosseteste (q.v.), a preacher of force as well as a polemical prelate. In the early fourteenth century William of Macclesfield and Walter of Winterbourne were prominent preachers of the Dominican order in England.

3. The Pre-Reformation Period.

The leading name here is that of John Wyclif (q.v.). His great work as Bible translator and reformer does not obscure that of his preaching. Some of his homilies have come down and give good evidence of his earnestness, learning, acuteness, and popular power. He trained and sent out many preachers to instruct the common people in Bible truth and give them a purer Gospel than they received at the hands of monks or parish clergy. Among the churchly clergy of this age none appear to have reached distinction as preachers.

2. The Reformation:

In Great Britain, as on the continent, the religious upheaval of the sixteenth century was vitally and powerfully related to preaching. (1) The worth of preaching as a religious force

1. General Account.

came to be more highly esteemed both by the preachers themselves and their hearers, and this naturally improved its tone. (2) Preaching was more Biblical. It now not only more clearly recognized the authority of the Bible, but it adopted a far more accurate and serious interpretation of Scripture. (3) Unavoidably the preaching was controversial and often hotly so. (4) The contents of sermons were thus quite theological and Biblical; but there was also much reasoning and illustration. (5) Preaching sought the people more than ever; less and less was it mere instruction of the clergy. Hence also the vernacular became now the rule and Latin the exception in the pulpit. This was not due solely to the Reformation, but it was accepted and fixed by that movement. (6) Preaching did not wholly escape the scholastic forms and the allegorizing methods of the Middle Ages, but there was improvement and progress toward better methods. (7) Modern preaching in the English tongue is the product of the Reformation. Before that time English preaching was comparatively undistinguished. Since then there has been none greater in history.

2. English Preachers.

John Colet (q.v.), professor at Oxford and dean of St. Paul's, though Erasmian rather than Lutheran, was a preacher of power. His striking lectures on Paul's Epistles at Oxford, and his popular preaching in London gave great impulse to the new ideas. The Bible translators—especially Tyndale and Coverdale (qq.v.)—were also preachers of influence. Chief among the preachers was Hugh Latimer (q.v.). His earnestness, boldness, acuteness, his knowledge of Scripture, his shrewd humor and tact, his racy English, all make Latimer one of the great preachers of history. Three other victims of the Marian reaction and persecution in 1555 are also notable as preachers: John Hooper (q.v.), bishop of Gloucester, who was diligent in and out of the pulpit, and from whom a few sermons of grasp, strength, and pungency have come down; Nicholas Ridley (q.v.), bishop of London, who was perhaps the deepest theologian of them all, but from whom no sermons are extant, though his preaching is highly praised by Foxe and others; and good John Bradford (q.v.), perhaps the most spiritual and edifying of the group, from whom remain a few excellent sermons. In the early years of Elizabeth there was something of a dearth of preachers and preaching. This was in part due to the preceding persecution, but also in part to the queen's cautious policy and her dislike or fear of the political influence of the pulpit. Worthy of mention are: Thomas Lever, whose sermons are said to have resembled Latimer's in boldness and spirit; Bernard Gilpin (q.v.), "the apostle of the north," whose eloquence and devotion are warmly praised by contemporaries; and the archbishops Edmund Grindal and Edwin Sandys (qq.v.). But the best preacher among the Elizabethan prelates was John Jewel (q.v.), bishop of Salisbury, who made his mark in the pulpit by his learning, eloquence, and devoutness.

3. The Scotch Preachers.

The Reformation in Scotland was perhaps more directly promoted by preaching than was the case anywhere else, and yet the literary remains of that preaching are very scanty. Such accounts and specimens as are extant exhibit the three essentials of reformatory eloquence: Scriptural basis, depth of conviction and corresponding fervor in appeal, and popular power. Before Knox the two preachers most often mentioned as preparing the way for him are Patrick Hamilton and George Wishart (qq.v.), both of whom were noted for earnestness and persuasiveness, and died as martyrs to their convictions. Nor must John Rough (d. 1557) be forgotten, the first minister to the reforming refugees at St. Andrews, who introduced Knox to the ministry there. Of John Knox himself (q.v.), maker and writer of history, patriot and statesman, theologian and reformer, the main thing to say is that he was all these by virtue of being in and above them all a preacher. One sermon only, with slight accounts of others, is all that remains from his pen; but the notices and results of his preaching give him a place of first rank among the great. Among his contemporaries and followers were: John Willock

(d. 1585), who ranks next to Knox in power and influence; Christopher Goodman (d. 1603), an Englishman by birth and education, but a faithful preacher of reform in Scotland; and James Lawson (d. 1584), the successor of Knox at St. Giles in Edinburgh.

3. The Seventeenth Century: This is well called "the classic age of the English pulpit." The momentous events of the age profoundly affected its preaching; and the pulpit was no small factor in shaping thought and action in all departments of the national life.

Seventeenth-century preaching generally, but less in England than elsewhere, exhibited some reaction from the freshness and force of the Reformation, yet manifested and continued both the substantial gains and much of the spirit of that revolution. Doctrine and controversy on the basis of Scripture continued to be a large element of the sermon, but there was also much appeal to the more spiritual and devotional sides of religious life. In English preaching marked diversities appear. The differences between Anglicans, Puritans, and Non-conformists, with a multitude of individual peculiarities, led to a rich and interesting variety in pulpit work. In Scotland, owing to the influence of Knox and the dominance of Presbyterianism, there was a greater uniformity of type. Yet there were certain common characteristics which distinguish the great preaching of this age. The more glaring faults may be reduced to three: (a) The general prevalence—perhaps inevitable, yet carried too far—of the dogmatic and polemical spirit; (b) the tendency to minute analysis and tedious prolixity; (c) the affectation of both pedantry and fancy, which mar much of the best pulpit work of the time. On the other hand the admirable virtues of that "classic" preaching may also be set down under three general statements: (a) the Protestant principle of appeal to the Bible as authority led to power in the grasp and application of Scriptural truth, though with some polemical forcing and use of allegorical fancies; (b) the place and effect of preaching as a recognized and practical force in life and affairs gave to the preachers a sense of mastery and power in their work; (c) the varied and splendid use of the English language fixed its rank as one of the noblest instruments of religious utterance ever known.

1. Character of Preaching.

(1) **English.** These fall into the two well-defined groups of Anglican as against Puritan and Non-conformist. The Anglicans divide into an earlier and a later group. Among the earlier may be named: Bishop Lancelot Andrewes (q.v.), somewhat heavy and pedantic, but strong with a tendency to mysticism; John Donne (q.v.), in early life courtier and poet but later a devout and earnest preacher somewhat given to poetic conceits and fancies; Joseph Hall (q.v.), bishop of Exeter and Norwich, pure and sweet of spirit, winsome in speech with a slight excess of ornament; and the eloquent defender of Protestantism, William Chillingworth (q.v.). The later group falls within the troublous times of the Commonwealth, Restoration, and Revolution, and chief among the mighty are: Jeremy Taylor (q.v.), marvelously gifted in fancy and diction, erudite and pious; Isaac Barrow (q.v.), mathematician, scholar, theologian, profound and exhaustive thinker, with a richness and strength of diction well suited to his mental methods; Robert South (q.v.), sharp and pugnacious in spirit and speech, but clear, forcible, and interesting; and John Tillotson (q.v.), moderate in temper and thought, strong without being powerful, clear without much beauty, a model of common sense. Of the Puritans proper there are: Thomas Adams (q.v.), weighty in thought and vigorous in style, called the "Shakespeare of the Puritans"; Thomas Goodwin (q.v.), devout, fanciful, strong; and the ever memorable pastor and earnest preacher at Kidderminster, Richard Baxter (q.v.). Among the Independents are the great theologian John Owen (q.v.) and the powerful thinker John Howe (q.v.). One English Presbyterian of first importance is Edmund Calamy (q.v.), popular preacher in London. The Baptists have the worthy names of John Bunyan (q.v.), Vavasor Powell (see Fifth Monarchy Men), a mighty Welsh preacher, and Benjamin Keach (q.v.), a scholarly and able pastor in London. (2) **Scotch.** Presbyterianism was the established religion of reformed Scotland, and among the faithful preachers of the time are: Alexander Hamilton (d. 1646), well trained, calm, able pastor at Edinburgh; David Dickson (q.v.), pastor, preacher, professor; Samuel Rutherford (q.v.), author of the well-known devotional *Letters*, a queer compound of devout preacher and sharp controversialist. (3) **American.** A number of Oxford and Cambridge men came over to New England, both Puritans and Independents, and brought the characteristic English preaching of the age to found that which was soon to become really American. A few of these early New England divines are: Francis Higginson, John Eliot, Thomas Hooker, John Cotton, Richard Mather, John Davenport, Roger Williams (qq.v.). The son and grandson of Richard Mather—Increase (1639) and Cotton (qq.v.)—were born in Boston and are the first notable American preachers of native growth. But distinctively American preaching is of the eighteenth century and after.

2. Leading Preachers.

4. The Eighteenth Century in the British Islands: In this period a low tone of religion prevailed, so that the time has been called "the dark night of Protestantism." The effect of the age was to produce a lower vitality in morals in the ministry, rationalism in the pulpit, and much tame and lifeless preaching even among the orthodox. But it was not all dark; there was among Christians a good leaven of faith and devotion, and in this century came the great revival under Whitefield and Wesley. Considerable diversity appeared in types of doctrine, in methods and spirit of individuals and groups. Morals received great emphasis. In theology relaxed views found expression in Unitarianism; Arminianism had a mighty uplift through Wesley; but Calvinism had able exponents among the evangelicals and the followers of Whitefield. Methods of preaching and style naturally varied with individuals. As compared with the former age there was less artificiality

1. Survey.

and pedantry, but some loss of life, beauty, and power. English preachers had never given as much attention to expository preaching as the Reformers on the continent, and sermons of the topical sort are more frequent in England. Some traces of the stiff and severe analysis of scholasticism remain; but the tendency is toward a more popular and simple presentation of truth. In general the eighteenth-century style is stately and solemn, sometimes heavy and pompous.

2. Leading Preachers.

(1) **Roman Catholic.** In England the Roman Church had a distinguished pulpit representative in John Milner (d. 1826). In Ireland Bishop Doyle was an admired pulpit orator, and is said to have been the first Irish Catholic preacher of distinction to use the English tongue. Walter Blake Kirwan (q.v.) began as a Roman Catholic but became Protestant. He was a man of remarkable eloquence. (2) **Church of England.** The lax and worldly group is represented in Jonathan Swift (d. 1745) of Dublin, and Lawrence Sterne (q.v.), rector of Sutton; both were more distinguished in literature than in the pulpit. The churchly orthodox include Francis Atterbury (q.v.), bishop of Rochester, who was more showy than profound; Joseph Butler (q.v.), bishop of Durham, author of the *Analogy* and of a series of sermons on Christian ethics; Samuel Horsley (q.v.), bishop of St. Asaph's, the powerful opponent of Unitarianism, and a vigorous preacher. The Evangelical group includes George Horne (q.v.), bishop of Norwich, a pleasing and popular preacher; William Grimshawe (d. 1763), rector at Haworth; William Romaine (q.v.), a much loved pastor chiefly in London; John Newton (q.v.), rector of Olney and later of St. Mary Woolnoth in London, friend of Cowper, writer of hymns and useful pastor and preacher. Above all were the two famous revivalists. George Whitefield (q.v.) came of humble origin but took a degree at Oxford and was ordained. He had a wondrous faculty of popular eloquence, and led thousands to Christ. John Wesley (q.v. and see METHODISTS) was of good birth and breeding, very thoroughly educated at Oxford. Calm and logical, but determined and masterful as preacher and organizer, he did work unsurpassed in the history of preaching. (3) **Presbyterian.** In England no distinguished preachers are found among the Presbyterians, but it is otherwise in Scotland where Presbyterianism was the established church. The "moderates" included John Logan (d. 1788) and Hugh Blair (q.v.), author of the *Rhetoric*. The Evangelical group contained John MacLaurin (d. 1754) and John Erskine (q.v.), both highly regarded as pastors and preachers. The "secessionists" were led out of the lax establishment by the pious Thomas Boston (q.v.) and the brothers Ebenezer and Ralph Erskine (d. 1756, 1754), three devoted and influential preachers. (4) **Non-conformist.** The famous scientist Joseph Priestley (q.v.) was also famed as a theologian of Unitarian opinions, and was a preacher of ability. Among the orthodox Independents the two best-known names are those of Isaac Watts (q.v.), better remembered as a hymnist than preacher, and Philip Doddridge (q.v.), teacher, hymnist, writer, pastor—a man of noble character and abundant usefulness. Among Baptists were the brilliant and scholarly Robert Robinson (q.v.), the judicious and solid Andrew Fuller (q.v.), theologian and missionary leader; and the fervent William Carey (q.v.), whose historic sermon before the Northampton Association in 1792 gave mighty impulse to the modern missionary movement.

5. The Eighteenth Century in North America: The Puritan preaching of New England, with its Biblical authority, its Calvinistic theology, its intellectual and ethical elevation, its ponderous scholasticism, and its solemn earnestness, forms the basis of American preaching in general. But the conditions of life—social, political, and religious—in the New World soon began to work important modifications in the developments from this original impulse, though without destroying its force. Among the more obvious distinctive qualities of American preaching may be noted: (1) Its remarkable variety—which makes any accurate general characterization impossible. The great medley of Christian denominations is reflected in the pulpit. Social life also—pioneer, rural, urban—produced different types of ministry. Nor has the intense political life of Americans been without influence upon their preaching. This suggests (2) the freedom which has characterized the American pulpit in all its history. "Liberty of prophesying" has found its goal in America. (3) An element of the first importance in American preaching has been its emphasis on evangelism. American preachers have not conceived their mission as a teaching function only, but also as proclamation of the Gospel. The labors and influence of George Whitefield (q.v.) in America entitle him to mention here also. Jonathan Edwards (q.v.) is the most eminent American preacher of this age. Philosopher and college president, he was also a preacher of admirable gifts of mind and heart. After him came his son, Jonathan Edwards, Jr. (q.v.), and his grandson, Timothy Dwight (q.v.), both of them distinguished theologians and preachers. Other Congregationalists are: Joseph Bellamy (q.v.); and Ezra Stiles (q.v.), brilliant scholar and president of Yale. The Presbyterians have the honored names of David Brainerd (q.v.), missionary to the Indians; Samuel Davies (q.v.), pastor of a rural charge in Virginia, then president of Princeton, who died at the age of thirty-six, a noble and admirable preacher, whose published sermons were long recognized as models; the remarkable Tennent family, of whom Gilbert (q.v.) was the most important, a "terrible preacher," austere but strong. Of the Baptists were such men as James Manning (q.v.), Daniel Marshall, Oliver Hart, John Gano, John Leland (q.v.), Samuel Stillman, who did their work about the middle and end of the century. The Methodists had the high-minded, self-sacrificing Francis Asbury (q.v.), who was chief among the founders of American Methodism and a preacher of considerable power.

6. The Nineteenth Century in the British Islands: All elements of the national life responded to the vigorous movements of this great epoch. The pulpit felt the touch of the time, and there is

no greater preaching in modern history than that of the British Islands during the nineteenth century. Movements in the political, social, and literary spheres all influenced the pulpit. And there was the more direct touch of the benevolent and religious activities of the age, among which missionary and philanthropic organization and effort are of special moment. In religious thought the three church parties, later distinguished as "low," "broad," and "high," began to appear in this period. The "Evangelical" view of Christianity was dominant in pulpit and pew. But under the lead of Unitarians and a few thinkers in the Church of England, aided by other influences, there was a decided trend toward "liberal" views. A few strong men in the establishment also were preparing the way for the coming sacramentarian movement. In respect of style, generally speaking, the eighteenth-century vogue—stilted, formal, dignified—was yet prevalent. In respect of influence the pulpit was able and esteemed. The Church of England Evangelical group was led by Charles Simeon (q.v.), beloved pastor at Cambridge for fifty years; not a deep thinker, but a preacher of spiritual power and a skilled homilist. Of the churchly school was Henry John Rose (q.v.), an impressive preacher. Among the beginners of the "Broad-church" tendency were Richard Whately (q.v.), archbishop of Dublin, a notable author and man; and the famous teacher at Rugby, Thomas Arnold (q.v.), whose sermons to boys exhibit his greatness of nature and mind. The Presbyterians of various schools had some distinguished men. The Unitarian element in England was headed by Thomas Belsham (q.v.). The Moderates in Scotland had a few leaders, while the Evangelical party was well represented by Andrew Thomson (q.v.). The brilliant but erratic Edward Irving (q.v.) attracted crowded congregations during his brief career in London. But the greatest Presbyterian preacher of this period was Thomas Chalmers (q.v.) notable for thoroughness and height of thought, sweeping and grand style, elevated and commanding character. It is hard to place the eccentric Rowland Hill (q.v.), who was ordained a deacon in the Established Church, sympathized in theology with the Calvinistic Methodists, and was pastor of the famous Surrey (Independent) Chapel in London; odd, but true and sincere, a preacher of freshness and power. The Independents possessed the pious and useful William Jay (q.v.), long pastor at Bath; not profound but an excellent preacher of strong Evangelical views, and writer on devotional topics. The most important Methodist preacher of the time was the eminent theologian and secretary of missions, Richard Watson (q.v.). Among the Baptists the admirable and once popular essayist John Foster (q.v.) preached with some success, and the wonderful Welshman, Christmas Evans (q.v.), was a preacher of powerful imagination and fervor; but first rank easily belongs to the gifted Robert Hall (q.v.), philosophical in intellect, highly cultured, elevated in style, commanding in eloquence, devout in spirit—one of the great masters of English pulpit discourse.

1. The First Third of the Century, 1801-33.

Literary and scientific work of a high order is characteristic of the age, and a powerful stimulus to preaching. There was also much thought and movement in religion, and these naturally and profoundly influenced preaching. Movements toward fuller liberty in religion must not be overlooked. The influence of philosophical, scientific, and critical speculation is strongly felt in modifying religious views. There was better exegesis of Scripture, but less regard for its authority. Social reforms encouraged and went along with evangelistic and missionary activities and found advocacy in the pulpit. There was a great variety of thought and method in groups and individuals, but the general trend of pulpit utterance was in the direction of freedom from conventionalisms, more adaptability to the people, without loss of either intellectual vigor or strength of conviction. Among Roman Catholics Cardinals Wiseman, Manning, and Newman were eminent prelates, but only Newman was specially distinguished as a preacher, and that was before he entered the Roman Catholic communion. In Ireland, however, there were not a few able preachers, such as: Thomas N. Burke, Archbishop Walsh (q.v.), Father Mathew (q.v.)—the great temperance orator, Father Boyle, Thomas J. Potter. In the Church of England the Evangelical group contains the rhetorical, popular, and earnest canon of St. Paul's, Henry Melvill (q.v.); and Hugh McNeile (d. 1879), Irish by birth and training, moving and tender in speech, beloved as rector in Liverpool and dean of Ripon. "High-church" views were strongly advocated by the unconventional but highly esteemed Walter F. Hook (q.v.), attractive preacher in Coventry and Leeds, and dean of Chichester. Here also belong the Oxford leaders, John Keble, E. B. Pusey, and J. H. Newman (qq.v.), of whom Newman was greatest in the pulpit. As a preacher he was deep-toned, intense, magnetic, with appealing personality and utterance, and a master of expression. Three quite different but influential men must be reckoned to the Broad-church party: Julius Hare (q.v.), devout, cultured, and sweet; F. D. Maurice (q.v.), thoughtful and independent in theology but a very influential mind; and the sensitive, high-strung, courageous F. W Robertson (q.v.), whose posthumous and briefly reported sermons are choice reading still and have had wide influence. Of the Independents there were: John Angell James (q.v.) of Birmingham, good pastor, and pleasing though not profound preacher; James Parsons of York (d. 1877), a clear and intense thinker with forceful utterance, and much in demand as preacher on occasions; Thomas Binney (q.v.), a powerful, practical leader and thinker of weight and strength in the pulpit. Two well-known men among the Methodists were Jabez Bunting (q.v.), a strong leader and preacher; and W. M. Punshon (q.v.), oratorical and popular and a widely useful man. The Presbyterians had John Cumming (q.v.) of London, whose eloquence drew crowds to hear his famous sermons on prophecy; Henry Cooke (q.v.), of Belfast, Ireland, a vigorous professor and preacher; and the several branches of Presbyteri-

2. Middle of the Century, 1833-69.

anism in Scotland had such famous preachers as Thomas Guthrie, R. S. Candlish, John Caird, Norman McLeod (qq.v), and John Ker. Of the Baptists F. A. Cox, B. W Noel (q.v.), and William Brock deserve mention; but the preeminent name is that of the young but already celebrated Charles H. Spurgeon (q.v.), who sprang at one bound into a world-wide and lasting fame as a preacher of wonderful power and built up a remarkable congregation and working church in London.

A general view of British preaching in this period reveals the continued influence of most of those forces which have already been described. If anything, the pressure of scientific and critical views was greater. Social questions and movements were more than ever characteristic of the age and the pulpit. Theological thinking was infinitely various, and no one school could claim dominance. A group of influential mystical preachers arose in the Keswick movement (see KESWICK CONVENTION); and there was much evangelistic preaching with earnest endeavor to reach "the masses." In the Church of England the older Evangelical views were fairly represented by J. C. Ryle (q.v.), bishop of Liverpool. A greater preacher than he was the witty and eloquent W. C. Magee (q.v.), bishop of Peterborough and archbishop of York. To the High-church group belongs the leading Anglican preacher of the age, H. P. Liddon (q.v.). Elevated in character, thought, and style, learned, fair to opponents, with pleasing presence and voice, he was a master in the pulpit. Perhaps to this school must be assigned the thoughtful and profound preacher on difficult subjects, J. B. Mozley of Oxford (q.v.). To the Broad-church group belong the cultured dean A. P. Stanley of Westminster (q.v.) and the brilliant and versatile F. W Farrar (q.v.). The great scholars J. B. Lightfoot and B. F. Westcott (qq.v.), both bishops of Durham, are also to be enrolled among the effective preachers of the age. The Roman Catholics had several preachers of ability and influence, chief among whom are perhaps Bernard Vaughan, who severely arraigned popular society in London, and Father Harper, who preached with effect a series of rather philosophical discourses. The Baptists of this period are ably represented by William Landels (q.v.); Alexander Maclaren (q.v.), the long active and beloved pastor at Manchester, whose published discourses have been an inspiration to thousands, with their clear, accurate, and spiritual exposition and application of Bible truth; John Clifford (q.v.), of London, the still active pastor and champion of religious freedom; John Turner Marshall, Hugh Stowell Brown (qq.v.), Richard Glover, and Charles Brown. Presbyterians of note are John Watson (q.v.), of Liverpool; Alexander Whyte (q.v.), of Free St. George's, Edinburgh, devout and mystical with special success in character studies; George Matheson (q.v.), the blind poetic and philosophic preacher and devotional writer; and George Adam Smith (q.v.), who with the "advanced" views of a modern critic combines fervor and power in the pulpit. The leading Methodist was Hugh Price Hughes (q.v.), active in social reforms as well as a preacher of great acceptance and success. With him should also be named M. G. Pearse, a man of talent and vigor, and the elevated, clear-thoughted, impressive W L. Watkinson. The Independents have not been behind others in the number and worth of their ministers, among whom were the eminent theologian and pastor R. W Dale of Birmingham (q.v.); the world-famous Joseph Parker of London (q.v.), a man of rare personality and conviction; George Campbell Morgan, Reginald John Campbell (qq.v.), and Charles Sylvester Horne. Besides the eminent leaders who have been named, there were many others in all the churches who helped to render the closing years of the nineteenth century illustrious in the annals of the British pulpit.

3. Close of the Century, 1869-1900.

7. The Nineteenth Century in Greater Britain: In Canada, Australia, British India, and South Africa—making necessary allowance for differences of environments and conditions—preaching in English has exhibited very much the same character as in the mother country. The different churches and opinions have had their representative men. There has not been a numerous native ministry, except in Canada: the supply has been kept up mostly from the home lands. The movements of modern thought in regard to both social and religious affairs have been keenly felt, but there has been on the whole perhaps a closer adherence to the Evangelical traditions. In India the earlier missionaries, William Carey, Alexander Duff, and Bishops Heber and Wilson (qq.v.), preached with acceptance to their fellow countrymen as well as conducted missionary operations; nor have there been wanting excellent preachers in later days, such as Bishop J. E. C. Welldon (q.v.). In Australia and New Zealand preaching has been more independent of the missionaries than in India. A few notable names are those of Dr. Gittos, Methodist, and Dr. North, Baptist, of New Zealand, whose work has counted for much in that dominion. In Australia the Roman Catholics had Cardinal Moran, and the Anglicans Bishop Moorhouse among their leading preachers. Presbyterians have taken a high stand in pulpit work, with such men as Principal Harper of Sydney, Dr. Marshall of Melbourne, and others. Of Methodists leading names are those of "Father" Watsford, a successful evangelist, and Dr. Fitchett, editor and author. Canada has naturally had the advantage of the other British possessions in the nativity, number, and independence of her preachers. Some of the better-known are Canon Cody among Episcopalians, Dr. Wilkes of Montreal among Congregationalists, Drs. McDowell, Herridge, Johnston, Milligan, and Gordon (q.v.; "Ralph Connor"), among Presbyterians; Douglas and Potts of the Methodists; and Cameron, Wallace, Trotter, McNeill, Farmer, Thomas, and others among the Baptists. Some of these—as well as others not mentioned—have published sermons and other writings, but the literature of preaching for Canada is not large.

8. The Nineteenth Century in the United States: The war between the States marks a deep cleft in the national life and gives a dividing line for the history of all subjects; religion and preaching

no less than others. A general survey of preaching in the earlier period shows that the main lines of life and progress which began in the eighteenth century had their natural development. Variety, freedom, practical adaptation and directness, evangelistic power continue to characterize the American pulpit. It responded to the demands of a progressive age and kept pace with the growth of culture and religion. The traditions, history, and sermons of the period indicate that the views of Christian truth which are usually called "orthodox," and "Evangelical," were in the ascendant, though "liberal" opinions did not lack free and able utterance. Preachers as a class were held in high esteem and had a strong influence. The pulpit was conscious of power, able and efficient. It is probable that the two decades from 1840 to 1860 witnessed on the whole the highest point of American preaching. Among the Roman Catholics may be named Bishop England (d. 1842) of Charleston, Archbishop Spalding (q.v.), and Archbishop Kenrick (q.v.). The Episcopalians had such men as G. T. Bedell (d. 1854), Stephen H. Tyng (q.v.), and his sons; Bishop Alonzo Potter of Pennsylvania (q.v.), and Bishop C. P. McIlvaine of Ohio (q.v.). Foremost among the Unitarians was W. E. Channing (q.v.), pastor in Boston, highly gifted in thought and style. Others of this body were Kirkland, Norton, H. W. Bellows (q.v.), and the agitator and reformer, rather than preacher, Theodore Parker (q.v.). The Congregationalists had many great men. Nathaniel Emmons (q.v.) had already achieved fame as a preacher and theologian in the preceding century, but his remarkable work and influence went on well into the nineteenth. Lyman Beecher (q.v.), the father of distinguished children, was himself a man of might and influence in the pulpit. Charles Grandison Finney (q.v.) with his strain of mysticism was also a cogent reasoner, a theologian and college president (Oberlin), but is best remembered as a remarkably successful evangelist. Horace Bushnell (q.v.), pastor at Hartford, was a man of powerful and independent mind, whose thoughtful sermons have had lasting influence. In the middle stage of his remarkable career Henry Ward Beecher (q.v.) was perhaps the most famous of all American preachers; a man of acute and versatile intellect, broad sympathies, splendid imagination, impressive personality, and so an orator of the first rank. To the Presbyterians likewise this was an age of pulpit excellence. Some of their best representatives are: Archibald Alexander (q.v.), and his son, James W. (q.v.), professor at Princeton and pastor in New York; Albert Barnes (q.v.), the commentator, pastor in Philadelphia; and James H. Thornwell (q.v.), of South Carolina, educator, theologian, preacher. To the Dutch Reformed Church belongs the beloved and eloquent George W. Bethune (q.v.), pastor in New York. Of notable Methodists were: the young Irishman John Summerfield (q.v.), called "seraphic" for his moving eloquence; William McKendree (d. 1835), one of the early Methodist bishops, a man of large mind and labors; Stephen Olin (q.v.), a strong and logical preacher; John P. Durbin (q.v.), original and striking; and the exuberant and rhetorical Henry B. Bascom (q.v.), one of the first bishops of the Southern Methodist Church. The Baptists also had not a few notable preachers, among whom were: William Staughton (d. 1829), of English birth, a very impressive speaker; Andrew Broaddus (d. 1848) of Virginia, preferring rural pastorates, a man of noble eloquence and great influence; Spencer H. Cone (d. 1855), pastor in New York, strong preacher and trusted leader; Francis Wayland (q.v.), for a short time pastor in Boston but better known as president of Brown University, a great preacher of solid thought and balanced judgment; and, now just at the height of his great powers and influence, Richard Fuller (q.v.), of South Carolina and Baltimore, a preacher of striking personality, broad culture, deep piety, and sweeping eloquence.

1. Before the Civil War.

Most of the characteristics and tendencies noticed in the preceding section went on with developed force during the wonderful era of expansion and growth in the country since the war. But some additional matters require notice. The differences between the North and the South—social, political, religious, temperamental—naturally were more or less reflected in the pulpit. The North was more commercial and progressive, the South more rural and conservative. There was more of political and reformatory preaching in the North, but the South had the balance in favor of a devout adherence to the evangelical traditions. In the armies on both sides there was excellent preaching by chaplains with much resultant good. After the war the North prospered and entered on an age of rapid accumulation of wealth; the impoverished South recovered very slowly, and only toward the close of the century began to regain its place in the national life. The North was more hospitable to new ideas in science, philosophy, and religion. There the struggle with scientific and critical unbelief, with the influx of various foreign peoples, and other modifying influences upon religious thought and custom, were more keenly felt; and the pulpit reflected all these things. Modern modes of thought have profoundly influenced preaching at the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century, and have greatly changed the aspect of American preaching on the whole. The pulpit has been less dignified, more inclined to sensation and opportunism, and has had less hold upon popular respect than formerly. Yet such loss has not been total, and some advantages have accrued. American preaching has been modern, popular in style, aggressive, evangelistic, successful. The Episcopalians have had such excellent preachers as Bishops Huntington, Doane, Potter, Dudley, Gailor, together with Drs. Newton, Rainsford, Greer, and others; but the preeminent name in the Episcopal pulpit of America is that of Phillips Brooks (q.v.), pastor in Philadelphia and Boston, and bishop of Massachusetts, a man of large mold, devout, sympathetic, cultured, refined, spiritual, with rapid and forcible address. The Congregationalists still had Beecher in his closing years and declining influence; but along with him were: R. S. Storrs of Brooklyn, W M. Taylor of

2. The Civil War and After.

New York, N. J. Burton of Hartford; and later Lyman Abbott, Newman Smyth, George A. Gordon of Boston, F W Gunsaulus (who began as Methodist) of Chicago, Newell D. Hillis of Plymouth Church, Brooklyn (qq.v.), and the widely known and useful evangelist, D. L. Moody (q.v.), a man of direct and forceful ways, no great thinker, but deeply in earnest, and a master of assemblies. The Presbyterians had not a few great men, such as John Hall (q.v.), Irish born, but pastor in New York; T. DeWitt Talmage (q.v.), of Brooklyn, sensational and flowery, but popular and effective; the erratic but moving David Swing (q.v.), of Chicago; the venerable and beloved Theodore L. Cuyler; A. T. Pierson, C. H. Parkhurst, D. J. Burrell, M. D. Babcock, G. T. Purves (qq.v.), and others in the North; and in the South Moses D. Hoge (q.v.), of Richmond, and B. M. Palmer (q.v.), of New Orleans, both of them cultured, beloved, and eloquent. The northern Methodists are represented by Bishops Matthew Simpson, J. P Newman, C. H. Fowler, F. T. Bristol, and the Rev. L. A. Banks (qq.v.). Southern Methodists also had some names of strong preachers to their credit, such as Bishops E. M. Marvin, Geo. F. Pierce, A. G. Haygood, A. W. Wilson, J. C. Granberry, J. J. Tigert, C. B. Galloway. Here also belongs the sensational and often rude popular lecturer and preacher, Samuel P. Jones (q.v.), whose fame and work were achieved partly because and partly in spite of his extraordinary pulpit methods. The Baptists had a number of excellent preachers during the period. George C. Lorimer (q.v.), born in Scotland, but active in Boston, Chicago, and New York, was a preacher of commanding abilities of thought and expression; P S. Henson (q.v.), of Philadelphia, Chicago, and Boston, has had a long and brilliant ministry; other notable names of living and dead are those of A. J. Gordon, R. S. MacArthur, T. G. Jones, J. L. Burrows, J. R. Graves, B. H. Carroll, J. B. Hawthorne. But preeminence was cheerfully accorded by his brethren to the devout and scholarly John A. Broadus (q.v.), for a short time pastor at Charlottesville, Virginia, but best known as professor and president of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, at Louisville, scholar, author, teacher, leader, but above all a tender, simple and persuasive preacher of the gospel.

9. Twentieth-Century Outlook: It is too early in the century to do more than point out that in all English-speaking lands the main elements and forces which ruled the pulpit at the close of the nineteenth century are operative and powerful at the beginning of the twentieth. Social and ethical preaching abounds. The turn of speculative philosophy toward spiritual idealism, instead of the materialism of the preceding age, has been accompanied by a mystical tendency in preaching, both among conservative Evangelicals and advanced critics. Some of the men already named are still active, and there are many others in all the churches to illustrate the varied spirit, aims, and methods of modern preaching in all countries where the English language prevails. E. C. DARGAN.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Much of the literature under HOMILETICS will be found pertinent, as manuals on the subject often contain a brief history of the pulpit. The works on the history of the church contain hints of value, and the literature under the articles on the great preachers named in the text is pertinent for details into which this bibliography can not enter. On the history of preaching in general consult: E. C. Dargan, *A History of Preaching . . . 70–1572*, New York, 1905 (with a bibliography, which, however, does not give places or dates of publication); John M. Neale, *Mediaeval Preachers and Mediaeval Preaching*, London, 1856; H. C. Fish, *History and Repository of Pulpit Eloquence*, 2 vols., New York, 1856–57; J. A. Broadus, *Lectures on the History of Preaching*, ib., 1876; A. Nebe, *Zur Geschichte der Predigt. Charakterbilder der bedeutendsten Kanzelredner*, 3 vols., Wiesbaden, 1879; R. Rothe, *Geschichte der Predigt von Anfängen bis auf Schleiermacher*, Bremen, 1881; G. J. Davies, *Successful Preachers. Being Biographical and Critical Sketches of Eminent Preachers*, New York, 1884; E. P. Hood, *The Throne of Eloquence: Great Preachers*, London, 1885; F. H. Wallace, *Witnesses for Christ; or, a Sketch of the History of Preaching*, Toronto, 1885; F. W. Farrar, *Hist of Interpretation*, New York, 1886; J. Ker, *Lectures on the History of Preaching*, London, 1888; G. Longhaye, *La Prédication. Grandes maîtres*, Paris, 1888; E. Boucher, *L'Éloquence de la chaire. Histoire littéraire*, Lille, 1894; J. Telford, *A History of Lay Preaching*, London, 1897; F. James, *The Message and the Messengers; Lessons from the History of Preaching*, ib., 1898; T. H. Pattison, *The History of Christian Preaching*, Philadelphia, 1903.

On the pulpit in different countries—Germany: J. N. Brischar, *Die katholischen Kanzelredner Deutschlands in den drei letzten Jahrhunderts*, 5 vols., Schaffhausen, 1867–71; C. G. Schmidt, *Geschichte der Predigt in der evangelischen Kirche Deutschlands von Luther bis Spener*, Gotha, 1872; L. Stiebritz, *Zur Geschichte der Predigt in der evangelischen Kirche von Mosheim bis auf die Gegenwart*, Gotha, 1876; R. Cruel, *Geschichte der deutschen Predigt im Mittelalter*, Detmold, 1879; G. Renoux, *Les Prédicateurs célèbres de l'Allemagne, leur vie, leurs œuvres*, Paris, 1881; H. Rinn, *Kulturgeschichtliches aus deutschen Predigten des Mittelalters*, Hamburg, 1883; W. Beste, *Die bedeutendsten Kanzelredner der ältern luther. Kirche von Luther bis zu Spener*, 3 vols., Dresden, 1886; A. Linsenmayer, *Geschichte der Predigt in Deutschland von Karl dem Grossen zum Anfang des 14. Jahrhunderts*, Munich, 1886; K. H. Sack, *Geschichte der Predigt in der deutschen evangelischen Kirche von Mosheim bis auf die letzten Jahre von Schleiermacher und Menken*, Heidelberg, 1886; F. R. Albert, *Die Geschichte der Predigt in Deutschland bis Luther*, Gütersloh, 1892–96; A. E. Schoenbach, *Studien zur Geschichte der altdeutschen Predigt*, Vienna, 1896.

On France: R. Turnbull, *The Pulpit Orators of France and Switzerland*, New York, 1848; A. Vincent, *Hist. de la prédication en langue française au XIX. siècle (1800–1866)*, Geneva, 1871; A. Hurel, *Les Orateurs sacrés a la cour de Louis XIV.*, 2 vols., Paris, 1874; L. Bourgain, *La Chaire française au XII. siècle d'aprés les manuscrits*, ib., 1880; P. Jacquinet, *Les Prédicateurs du XVII. siècle avant Bossuet*, ib., 1885; A. Lecoy de la Marche, *La Chaire française au moyen âge*, ib., 1886; J. Fontaine, *La Chaire et l'apologétique au XIX. siècle; études critiques et portraits contemporains*, ib., 1887; A. Samouillan, *Étude sur la chaire et la société française au quinzième siècle*, Toulouse, 1891; P Stapfer, *La Grande Prédication chrétienne en France*, Paris, 1898; A. Bernard, *Le Sermon au XVIII. siècle. Étude hist. et critique sur la prédication en France de 1715 à 1789*, ib., 1901; A. de Coulanges, *La Chaire française au dix-huitième siècle*, ib., 1901; C. H. Brooke, *Great French Preachers*, 2 vols., London, 1904.

On Great Britain: J. C. Ryle, *Christian Leaders of the Last Century*, Edinburgh, 1869; J. E. Kempe, *Classic Preachers of the English Church*, 2 series, London, 1877–78; E. J. Evans, and W. F. Hurndall, *Pulpit Memorials*, ib., 1878; J. H. Bloom, *Pulpit Oratory in the Time of James the First Considered and beautifully Illustrated by Original Examples, A.D., 1620–21–22*, ib., 1831; O. Jones, *Preachers of Wales*, ib., 1885; J. C. Jones, *The Welsh Pulpit of To-Day*, ib., 1885; W M. Taylor, *The Scottish Pulpit from the Reformation*, ib., 1887; W. G. Blaikie, *Preachers of Scotland, 6th to 19th Century*, Edinburgh, 1888; H. Rashdall, *The Friars Preachers of the University*, Oxford, 1890; E. L. Cutts, *Parish Priests and their People in the Middle Ages in England*, London, 1898; J. Brown, *Puritan Preaching in England*, ib., 1900; *Liber exemplorum ad usum prædicantium*, ed. A. G. Little, Aberdeen, 1908 (a work

compiled between 1270 and 1279 by an English Franciscan in Ireland).

On the United States: H. Fowler, *The American Pulpit: Sketches, Biographical and Descriptive, of living American Preachers*, New York, 1856; W. B. Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, 9 vols., New York, 1857 sqq.; J. W. Thornton, *The Pulpit of the American Revolution; or, the Political Sermons of the Period of 1776*, Boston, 1860; H. Haupt, *Die Eigenart der amerikanischen Predigt*, Giessen, 1907.

On other countries: J. Hartog, *Geschiedenis van der Predikkunde in de Kerk van Nederland*, Utrecht, 1887; V L. Nannestad, *Portraiter fra Kirken. Bidrag til en Karakteristik of dansk Prædiken i det nittende Aarhundredes sidste Halvdel*, Copenhagen, 1899; F. Zanotto, *Storia della Predicazione nei secoli della letteratura italiana*, Modena, 1899; L. Marenco' *L'Oratoria sacra italiana nel medio evo*, Savona, 1900.

On the modern pulpit: H. C. Fish, *Pulpit Eloquence of the Nineteenth Century*, New York, 1857; E. A. Park, *Pulpit Eloquence of the Nineteenth Century . . . with an Introductory Essay*, Boston, 1874; A. M. Littlejohn, *The Christian Ministry at the Close of the Nineteenth Century*, New York, 1884; *Camera Obscura, Modern Anglican Preachers*, London, 1892; *Preachers of To-day*, ib., 1899; J. Edwards, *Nineteenth Century Preachers and their Methods*, ib., 1902; L. O. Brastow, *Representative Modern Preachers*, New York, 1904; idem, *The Modern Pulpit, Homiletic Sources and Characteristics*, ib., 1906; W. C. Wilkinson, *Modern Masters of Pulpit Discourse*, ib., 1905; C. L. Slattery, *Present Day Preaching*, ib., 1909.

PREBEND: The term applied originally to the food given to monks or clergy at their common table; later it was made to include the Benefice (q.v.), when, in consequence of the breaking-up of community life, the revenues of the corporate foundations were divided and fixed incomes were assigned to individual members of such foundations. Although this process did not everywhere lead to the creation of prebends, wherever they were thus established a portion of the revenues was still reserved for daily distribution so that the term " prebend " sometimes retained its original application. As a rule, however, a distinction is drawn between prebends and daily allotments. To the prebend belong fixed and definite revenues, including tithes, usufruct of certain real estate, and especially a residence for each prebendary. There are also various distributions from endowments, although these as a rule apply only to actual residents. E. SEHLING.

In English ecclesiastical law, which here as everywhere is closely connected with common usage, the term prebend is used for any endowment given to a cathedral or collegiate church for the maintenance of a clergyman. A canonry is a right to a place in the cathedral chapter and stall in the choir, a prebend is the income for the support of the canon. Hence prebendary and canon are commonly used as equivalent. In strictness prebend and prebendary are more inclusive terms, as some in receipts of prebends are not members of the chapter and therefore are not canons. It is not necessary that a prebendary be resident; he may have a benefice elsewhere with cure of souls, where he must live except when at the cathedral for his term of service.

PRECIOUS STONES.

I. General Description and Uses.
II. Names and Varieties.

I. General Description and Uses: Under the term " precious stones " the Hebrew included not only the " noble " stones but the less valuable gems. These were obtained not in Palestine but from the outside world, according to tradition from Ophir (I Kings x. 11), and the queen of Sheba presented such to Solomon (I Kings x. 2). Ezek. xxvii. 22, cf. xxxvii. 13, seems to show that the people of Sheba and neighboring tribes were the merchants who supplied the markets of Tyre with these articles (see ARABIA), while the Phenicians supplied the Hebrews. The art of mounting and engraving gems, along with the knowledge of industrial arts, came to the Hebrews from Phenicia, though just when this took place is not known. According to the priestly writer (Ex. xxviii. 11), the art of seal engraving was practised by the Hebrews in the wilderness. Under these circumstances it is not surprising that the seals which have survived resemble those of the Phenicians in form, writing, and ornamentation, so that discrimination between Hebrew and Phenician gems is not always possible. The only certain criteria are the place of discovery, or the style of the design, or the name in case that contains a divine name as an element (as in the seals of *Obadyahu, Shebhanyahu, Abhiyahu*, cf. cuts in Benzinger, *Archäologie*, pp. 225 sqq., Freiburg, 1907). But wherever these seals were made, they betray the influence of Assyrian-Babylonian art; the lion on the seal embodying the design from Megiddo (*Mitteilungen und Nachrichten des deutschen Palästina Vereins*, ii., 1904) is the same as on Babylonian sculptures. One may therefore speak of a conventional manner of representation; this is further confirmed by the use of such ornaments as the winged disc of the sun, the steinbok, hare, tree of life, etc. Precious stones were employed principally for seals and signets. The latter were at all times important in the East, furnishing as they did a substitute for the signature. Gems may have served also as ornaments in earrings, nose-rings, frontlets, and bracelets (Cant. v. 14). II Sam. xii. 30 may refer to the crown of Moloch (q.v.); precious garments were no doubt adorned with gems (Ezek. xxviii. 13; Judith x. 21); golden vessels also were decorated with them (Ecclus. l. 9). This luxury, however, belongs to a late period, being foreign to the simplicity of ancient custom. Precious stones constituted a considerable part of the treasures of Hezekiah, according to the Chronicler (II., xxxii. 27), while the same writer enhances the splendor of Solomon's Temple by describing its walls as adorned with them (I., xxix. 4; II., iii., 6), though the earlier record does not involve this (I Kings iv.) and it seems to be precluded by I Kings xiv. 26; II Kings xiv.14, xvi. 17, xviii. 16, where the removal of every thing that was valuable in the Temple is recorded. The later high-priestly dress, as described in the priest code, shows a lavish use of precious stones (Ex. xxviii. 9 sqq.). The custom of describing precious possessions in terms of gems (Job xxviii. 15 sqq.; Prov. xvii. 8, xxvi. 8, vii. 9) led to the practise of using the names of precious stones in describing the glories of the future city of God (Isa. liv. 11–12; Rev. xxi. 18 sqq.), even of the very glory of God (Ezek. i. 26; Dan. x. 6; Rev. iv. 3).

II. Names and Varieties: The following list of precious stones mentioned in the Bible is arranged according to the Hebrew or Greek alphabet. The

explanation of the Hebrew names can not always be given with certainty, nor can the correspondence of certain stones with the Greek names be always certified (cf. Josephus, *Ant.*, III., vii. 5; *War*, V., vii.; Pliny, *Hist. nat.*, xxxvii. for treatment of gems known to the ancients). (1) *Odhem*, Septuagint *sardion*, Vulgate *sardius*, is the carnelian, a stone popular in antiquity and often used for signets (a seal from Jerusalem is of this material; *Revue biblique*, xii. 605). The best specimens come from the vicinity of Babylon (Pliny, xxxvii. 105–106). The Hebrew name is derived from its reddish-brown color, the Greek name from the city of Sardis, where Pliny asserts that it was found. (2) *'Aḥlamah* (Ex. xxviii. 19, xxxix. 12) is according to the Septuagint and Vulgate the amethyst (Rev. xxi. 20), a comparatively common transparent, violet, wine-colored, gray-white, or brownish crystalline quartz found according to Pliny (xxxvii. 121 sqq.) especially near Jerusalem, but also in Egypt, Arabia, and Armenia. (3) *Ekdaḥ*, "the sparkling" (Isa. liv. 12), probably the carbuncle (see no. 10), unless the Septuagint reading "crystal" be followed (see no. 13). (4) *Bareḳeth* (Ex. xxviii. 17, xxxix. 10; Ezek. xxviii. 13), Septuagint, Josephus, and Vulgate *smaragd*, A.V. "carbuncle" (Judith x. 21; Tobit xiii. 17; Ecclus. xxxii. 8; Rev. iv. 3, xxi. 19), A.V. "emerald," Sanscrit *markata* (P de Lagarde, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, iii. 44, Göttingen, 1896). It is found on the confines of Upper Egypt and Nubia, was highly valued among the ancients, and was used for medical purposes, being regarded as good for the eyes. Herodotus, Pliny, and Theophrastus speak of smaragds of colossal size in certain sanctuaries; they also comprised under that name less valuable green stones like dioptase and green jasper. (5) *Gabhish* (Job xxvii. 18) is the crystal (Rev. iv. 6, xxii. 1), properly "ice," "the frozen" (P. de Lagarde, *Reliquiæ juris*, xxii., Leipsic, 1856); the ancients regarded the rock-crystal as ice hardened by vehement cold (Pliny, *Hist. nat.*, xxxviii. 9; cf. Diodorus, ii. 52; see no. 13). (6) *Yaḥalom* (Ex. xxviii. 18, xxxix. 11; Ezek. xxviii. 13), always *yaspis* in the Septuagint and Vulgate, A.V. "diamond," mentioned also Rev. iv. 3, xxi. 11, 18, 19, an opaque quartz of diverse coloring (red, brown, yellow, greenish, gray, dark), was much used by the ancients for seals. So the lion seal from Megiddo is "jasper." The common opal and semi-opal may have been included in this category by Pliny (xxxvii. 217). (7) *Yashpe* (Ex. xxviii. 20, xxxix. 13; Ezek. xxviii. 13) on account of the similarity of the sound of the name is identified with the jasper, though no etymological connection is traceable. The Septuagint and Josephus render it "onyx," the Vulgate "beryl"; an interchange of (6) and (7) may be assumed in the Septuagint. (8) *Kadhkodh* (Isa. liv. 12, Septuagint *yaspis*, Symmachus *karchedonion;* Ezek. xxvii. 16, Septuagint *chorchos*); Hebrew r and d are interchanged or misread in the versions, so that *karchedon* is the chalcedony of the ancients (De Lagarde, *Reliquiæ juris*, x.), a red stone of glittering splendor (Pliny, "Carthaginian carbuncle"), not the common blue flint. It was used for gems and seals (cf. Rev. xxi. 19). (9) *Leshem* (Ex. xxviii. 19, xxxix. 12), Septuagint *ligurion*, Vulgate *ligurius;* according to Pliny (viii. 137, xxxvii. 54) a fire-colored stone like the carbuncle, considered by the ancients a kind of amber (xxxvii. 34–35). (10) *Nophek* (Ex. xxviii. 18, xxxix. 11; Ezek. xxvii. 16, xxviii. 13), Septuagint *anthrax*, Vulgate *carbunculus*, a red stone, the ruby. On account of its hardness it was not cut by the ancients. It is better to identify it with the *lappaka* of the Amarna Tablets and the Egyptian *mphkt*, green malachite, obtained by the Egyptians in the mines of Sinai. (11) *Sappir*, often mentioned (Ex. xxiv. 10; Ezek. xxviii. 13; Job xxviii. 6, 16; Isa. liv. 11; Rev. xxi. 19); when the precious sapphire is mentioned, the blue variety is doubtless meant. Pliny (xxxvii. 120 sqq.) and Theophrastus call the lapis lazuli "sapphire," which is the stone probably meant in the Old Testament. (12) *Piṭedhah* (Ex. xxviii. 17, xxxi. 10; Ezek. xxviii. 13; Job xxviii. 19), Sanscrit *pita*, "the yellow," according to Job, coming from Ethiopia (see Cush), answers to topaz (Rev. xxi. 20), a transparent stone described by Strabo (xvi. 770) and Diodorus (iii. 38) as "golden" (Pliny, "greenish yellow"), said by the last-named to have come from the topaz island supposed to be in the Red Sea. (13) *Ḳerah* (Ezek. i. 22), properly "ice," see no. 5. (14) *Shebho* (Ex. xxviii. 19), according to early tradition the agate, highly appreciated in antiquity, though not in the time of Pliny; there are many varieties, and it is abundant in Syria. (15) *Shoham*, often named (see below); the Hebrew tradition places its origin in Havilah (q.v.). Two large stones of this variety, each having the names of six tribes of Israel inscribed, were on the shoulders of the high priest. Tradition regarding it vacillates: the Septuagint (Ex. xxviii. 20, xxxix. 13), the Targum, and the Peshito call it "beryl," with which corresponds the Septuagint of Gen. ii. 12, *prasinos*, "leek-gem," since the leek-green chrysoprase was classed anciently among the beryls (so Pliny, xxxvii. 77, 113). In Ex. xxviii. 9, xxxv. 27, xxxix. 6 the Septuagint renders *smaragd*, "emerald," in Job xxviii. 16 "onyx," and once *sardius*. The Vulgate reads *sardonyx*. The last-named, sardius, and onyx belong to the same species, the chalcedony (cf. Dillmann on Gen. ii. 12). (16) *Shamir* (Jer. xvii. 1; Ezek. iii. 9; Zech. vii. 12), the diamond, is not numbered among the precious stones; the Hebrews could not polish it, but knew its use as a point and its insuperable hardness (Jer. xvii. 1; Ezek. iii. 9; Zech. vii. 12). (17) *Tarshish* (Ex. xxviii. 20, xxxix. 13; Ezek. i. 16, x. 9, xxviii. 13; Cant. v. 14; Dan. x. 6), generally rendered "chrysolite" by the versions, but the Septuagint retains *tharsis* in Ezek. i. 16; Cant. v. 14, *anthrax* in Ezek. x. 9 (see no. 10); the Vulgate renders "hyacinth" in Cant. v. 14. There is no consistent tradition.

The Apocalypse in describing the foundation stones of the New Jerusalem (xxi. 19 sqq.) names twelve precious stones, seven of which can with probability be referred to Old-Testament names (see nos. 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 11, 12 above). In all likelihood these twelve stones are identical with those on the breast-plate of the high priest, so that the other five have a place among those enumerated, but can not be certainly identified. They are: (18) the

beryl (Rev. xxi. 20), perhaps identical with no 15, a variety of the emerald of smaller value; the sea-green stone most valued by the ancients came from India. (19) Chrysolite (xxi. 20), often identified in tradition with no. 17 above; the stone so called in modern times is a light green, but that a gold-colored stone exists is stated by Fraas (cf. E. C. A. Riehm, *Handwörterbuch*, p. 334 note, Bielefeld, 1894–99); Pliny (xxxvii. 90–91, 126–127) also describes it as gold-colored. (20) Chrysoprasus (xxi. 20) may perhaps be identified with no. 15, a gray transparent chalcedony. (21) Hyacinth, A.V "jacinth" (xxi. 20), came from Ethiopia (Pliny, xxxvii. 125–126), and answers to the stone known to mineralogists as zircon, a changeable red or yellow stone. (22) Sardonyx (xxi. 20) is partly identified by tradition with no. 15 above.

I. Benzinger.

Bibliography: A. Furtwängler, *Antike Gemmen*, 3 vols., Leipsic, 1900; A. T. Hartmann, *Die Hebräerin am Putztisch und als Braut*, i. 278 sqq., iii. 27 sqq., Amsterdam, 1809; K. E. Kluge, *Handbuch der Edelsteinkunde*, Leipsic, 1860; C. W. King, *Natural Hist. of Precious Stones: Antique Gems*, London, 1866; J. Menant, *Les Pierres gravées*, 2 parts, Paris, 1883-85; J. H. Middleton, *Engraved Gems of Classical Times*, Cambridge, 1891; H. Lewy, *Die semitischen Fremdwörter im Griechischen*, pp. 53–62, Berlin, 1895; Nowack, *Archäologie*, i. 130 sqq.; *DB*, iv. 619–621; *EB*, iv. 4799–4812; *JE*, v. 593–596; and the commentaries on the passages of Scripture cited in the text.

PRECIST: One who has the expectation of a benefice, this expectation being granted him by the possessor of the "right of first requests." Since this right involves the duty of issuing formal *rescripta de providendo*, which the pope may issue in certain cases, those for whom papal provision is thus made are also termed precists until they receive the benefices in question. (H. F. Jacobson†.)

PRECONIZATION: A term derived from the medieval Latin *præconizare*, *præconisare*, "to proclaim publicly," and denoting the act whereby the pope, in the college of cardinals, proclaims as bishops those prelates who have been found on examination to be properly qualified for the episcopal office, and assigns them their sees. (H. F. Jacobson†.)

PREDESTINATION.

I. Scriptural Doctrine.
The Old Testament (§ 1).
The Gospels (§ 2).
The Pauline Epistles (§ 3).
Other New-Testament Writings (§ 4).
II. Church Doctrine.
The Eastern Church (§ 1).
The Western Church (§ 2).
Augustine (§ 3).
Post-Augustinian Views (§ 4).
Scholastic Theology (§ 5).
Later Roman Catholic View (§ 6).
The Reformers (§ 7).
Post-Reformation History (§ 8).

Predestination in the wider sense is the eternal predetermination of God's universal design or specific ends; and, in the most restricted sense, the foreordination in the inscrutable counsels of God by an eternal unchangeable decree of a certain number to eternal salvation, which is called election, and a certain number to eternal destruction, which is called reprobation. The doctrine, historically, results from the search for the certainty of salvation, which resolves itself in a conscious faith in the everlasting foundations of grace in God.

I. Scriptural Doctrine: Fundamental in the Old Testament is the belief in the election of Israel as God's own people, revealed first to the patriarchs and finally illustrated in the covenant.

1. The Old Testament. God is the source of blessing and a safe refuge: Israel is the elect, the bearer of salvation (Isa. xlv. 4). Every event is determined in the divine will. God leads and inclines men, even hardens their hearts to bring to pass his higher purposes (Gen. xxv. 23; Ex. iv. 21, vii. 3, ix. 16; Josh. xi. 20); but his activity is not irresistible. The election of Israel rests upon divine grace and is the act of unqualified love. Not until the time of Ezekiel was this election regarded as applied to individuals, and then it was regarded as an act before time.

In the New Testament, Israel, by the rejection of the Messiah, has forfeited its distinction, and election has passed to the believers in Christ. According to the Synoptic Gospels, Jesus is sent to all that were lost. He, as the risen one, sends forth his disciples and offers salvation to all the nations (Matt. xxviii. 19–20). Salvation is based solely on God's loving purpose conceived before the foundation of the world (Matt. xi. 26, xxv. 34). God does not coerce but leaves the acceptance of salvation to the free will of man (Matt. xxiii. 37). Meanwhile the idea of free will makes place for that of divine election, especially in Matthew. Many are

2. The Gospels. called but few chosen (Matt. xx. 16, xxii. 14); for the elects' sake the days of tribulation shall be shortened (Matt. xxiv. 22; Mark xiii. 20). But the elect are those found worthy among the called and embrace all the community of the New-Testament believers. Condemnation falls on those only who reject Christ. In the Fourth Gospel the Evangelist has in mind a certain metaphysical predisposition determining the receptivity of Christ's influence and accordingly dividing men into those who are "of the truth" and those who are children of evil (John vi. 44–45, x. 29, xvii. 2, 6, 9, xviii. 37). But the saving purpose of God's love embraces all men (John iii. 16), and whosoever comes will be accepted (vi. 37, vii. 37). The attainment of salvation is based on the inworking of God. Man may accept or reject Christ and is responsible. For all those who have attained salvation the work has been wrought entirely by God and they are proved to be "of the truth"; for those who are lost, the divine activity consists in punishment for the rejection of salvation.

The doctrine of election received a closer definition by the Apostle Paul. The Gentiles are also elected, in spite of the Jews having been the chosen race, and the Jews shall nevertheless be saved in spite of their apparent rejection and hardening of heart; for man is justified by faith, not works. In other words, the ultimate ground of salvation is not in man's effort, but in God the source of all good, and he chooses by his sovereign freedom as he will, out of love, the gift of which is his grace

(cf. Rom. ix.–xi.). To make certain of the gift of grace through conscious faith and of eternal salvation in God, assurance is given by reference to divine election. Paul sets forth, principally in the Epistle to the Ephesians, that man, though involved in sin, yet remains an object of divine love. God has provided salvation in Christ and offers pardon and reconciliation. That which is realized in time was determined in the ever-existing, immutable divine counsel; namely, to send Christ and save all those joined by faith in him. This eternal purpose is that upon which the conscious salvation of those in Christ rests; as the self-determination of God to benevolence, it also appears as grace. This purpose recognized through grace involves the selection of those to be redeemed, the elect. Correlates of this are election and calling which are inseparable. Calling is, for Paul, the entrance into Christian unity; election, however, is a transcendental act in which the universal design is to be distinguished from a predetermination to a specific end. The word election in II Thess. ii. 13, refers to the primordial choosing; in I Cor. i. 27–28, to an election by which believers are to enter into a certain relation with the world. Election fulfils itself in the act of faith. If the calling makes certain who is chosen, the gift of salvation to the elect results on the ground of faith. In the consciousness of faith the individual is certain of his election, for the fact of his believing is a result of his election. But the negative deduction, that unbelief is likewise grounded in an act of the divine will, is not drawn by Paul. How the election of individual believers reconciles itself with the universal will of grace is to be made clear by the condition of the fulfilment of that will in time. How the experience of salvation conditioned upon human self-determination is reconciled with the fact that God while working faith fulfils election remains to be explained. Acts of self-determination are acts of obedience to God, the source of all good (Phil. ii. 12–13; Col. iii. 12–13). Of special importance is the question whether salvation is absolutely assured to the elect, or whether they may fall from grace. In this connection those passages are relevant which are supposed to support the doctrine of particular predestination. In Eph. i. 4-6, election is foreordained; but a pretemporal division of mankind is not expressed. In Rom. viii. 28–30, the phrase " the called according to his purpose " seems to justify particularism. The sense of the passage turns upon the term " foreknown," which may mean not an effective foreknowledge but a recognition beforehand of individual believers and their predetermination to become Christlike. In Rom. ix.–xi., Israel is to be saved in time in spite of its resistance, and in ix. 22–24 there seems to be present the idea of a predetermination to destruction as well as to glory. Different constructions have been made of the passage: (a) In Rom. ix. the absoluteness of God's will is assumed but later supplemented (Meyer); (b) Paul, in this discussion, has in mind God's part which has its causes as well as its effects in the historical development (Beyschlag); (c) there is an antinomy between a benevolent God and a hostile God, and Rom. ix. teaches a determinism which leaves in doubt whether a particular or a universal predestination is meant (Holtzmann, Pfleiderer); (d) in Rom. ix. election no less than reprobation presupposes belief no less than unbelief, which does not occur without free self-determination. The attitude of man somehow conditions the divine act, and there is no double counsel of election. Ripe for destruction are those who through their own guilt have brought it down upon themselves (Hofmann; B. Weiss). Paul has in mind the historical fate of a people, not the consideration of salvation and destruction. Again, when God hardens the hearts, this is a primitive judgment; necessity to sin is the penalty for yielding to sin. Free self-determination is emphasized as well as divine omnipotence. The Pastoral Epistles continue the same conception.

3. Pauline Epistles.

The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews starts with the postulate that the believer may fall from grace, and holds that God does no violence to the free will of man; but on the other hand, the impossibility of repentance on the part of those who have lapsed from their faith is represented as the consequence of the divine judgment. Self-hardening is suggested (iii. 7–8, xii. 17), and the passages indicate but a single period of probation for everyone. In Revelation the chosen are those who have accepted their election by faith (xvii. 14). The counsel of salvation is universal. Even the last judgment is intended to call the world to repentance (cf. ix. 20–21, xvi. 9, 11). The elect are those who partake of salvation (cf. I Peter ii. 9). Election pertains to the choosing of the individuals fulfilled in time and is synonymous with calling. The passage I Peter ii. 8 implies a predestinarian historical point of view, but does not teach a predetermination of unbelievers to reprobation. Christians owe their state to regeneration (James i. 18) and to election (ii. 5). In the Acts election of grace is implied (ix. 15, xiii. 48, vii. 42), which presupposes the free self-determination of individuals. (G. HOENNICKE.)

4. Other New-Testament Writings.

II. Church Doctrine: Previous to Augustine there was no serious development in Christianity of a theory of predestination. Until then the rich materials of the New Testament, especially of the writings of Paul, remained unutilized or were subject to exegetical discursiveness. That the Greek Fathers stopped short with merely superficial historical revelation and free personality is due to the necessity of asserting over against pagan and Gnostic naturalistic determinism the autonomy of man; and over against the evolutionary primal power, the transcendent personality of God. To them this autonomy was the distinguishing characteristic of human personality, the basis of moral responsibility, a divine gift whereby man might choose that which was well-pleasing to God (Justin, *I Apol.*, x. 63, xliii. 10, II., vii. 3; Eng. transl., *ANF*, i. 165–66, 216, 177). Sin could not destroy this autonomy, could at most only weaken it and lead it intellectually astray (Origen, *Contra Celsum*, iii. 66–69; Eng. transl., *ANF*, iv. 490–492); and Irenæus (*Hær.*, IV., xxxvii. 3; Eng. transl., *ANF*, i.

1. The Eastern Church.

519) could place side by side "the autonomy of man and the counsel of God who constraineth not." None of the Greek Fathers conceived a revelation by the Spirit to the individual soul transcending a historical and intellectual presentment of the truth; and though there are vague allusions to the "synergism" of God in the mysteries, with the man of moral endeavor the human will always selects from those operations. God gives the power, man must furnish the will (Clement, *Quis dives*, xxi.; *Strom.*, VI., xii. 37, VII., vii. 82; Chrysostom on Phil. ii. 13; Origen, *De principiis*, III., ii. 3; Eng. transl., *ANF*, iv. 331; and on Rom. iii. 19). There gradually arose, however, a concept of divine foreknowledge which prepared the way for the formal recognition, but also actual rejection, of the doctrine of predestination, based on such passages as II Tim. ii. 25 (cf. Justin, *Apol.*, I, xxviii. 56; Eng. transl., *ANF*, i. 172; *Trypho*, xlii. 78; Eng. transl., i. 216; Irenæus, *Hær.*, IV., xxix. 2; Eng. transl., *ANF*, i. 502); and similar meanings were attributed even to Biblical passages of directly opposite tendency. According to Justin (*I Apol.*, lxi. 71; Eng. transl., *ANF*, i. 183) birth differs from regeneration in that the former is a thing done to man, while the latter he voluntarily chooses. John of Damascus, first formulating the doctrine of predestination (*De fide orthodoxa*, II., xxix. 95; *MPG*, xciv. 968–969), distinguished the divine "will preceding," which conditionally aims at the salvation of all men, from the "will following," which restricts the number of the elect in particular to those whom foreknowledge perceives to be worthy. This is yet the orthodox doctrine of the Eastern Church. The Russian Catechism (i. 3) accordingly declares: "Since God foresaw that some would choose the good and others the evil, he predestined the former to glory and rejected the latter."

2. The Western Church.

In the Western Church, up to the time of Augustine, the fixed principles of free will (Tertullian, *Adv. Marcionem*, ii. 6; Eng. transl., *ANF*, iii. 301–303; Ambrose, *De Jacobo*, i. 1) and of divine foreknowledge (Tertullian, *ut sup.*, ii. 23; Eng. transl., iii. 315; Ambrosiaster on Rom. viii. 29) underwent no essential revision, though so deep was the feeling of the working of grace on the individual that the statements of the Latin Fathers are far more in harmony with the Bible than those of the Greek Fathers. The development of the doctrine of original sin after Tertullian, and the emphasis which Cyprian laid on the Church and her means of grace deepened the concept of the operations of grace, transcending mere illumination of intellect. Cyprian ascribes all good to God (*Epist.*, i. 4; Eng. transl., *ANF*, v. 276; *De oratione Domini*, xiv.; Eng. transl., *ANF*, v. 451); Tertullian, on the other hand, teaches a power of grace which modifies free will (*De anima*, xxi. 39; Eng. transl., *ANF*, iii. 202); and Ambrose in passages expresses himself synergistically (*In Lucam*, i. 10, ii. 84), and also almost in terms of predestination (vii. 27).

3. Augustine.

The deeper Western doctrine of grace was carried to its logical conclusions by Augustine (see Augustine, Saint, of Hippo), both as a result of personal experience and in consequence of his study of the Bible, especially of the writings of Paul. At first he wavered between the conviction that feeling and experience yielded to the working of grace but that reason clung to free will (cf. *Soliloquia*, I., i. 5). Even then his religious interest led him to distinguish clearly faith as the root from works as the fruit, thinking to have found the point, in the origin of faith, where free will is alone operative; election was based on the foreseeing of faith (Rom. ix. 11). In 397, however, he came to the conviction that faith itself is a divine gift, and henceforth this belief in a grace that is the source of all good in man underlies Augustine's entire theological system. This attitude of Augustine evoked the opposition of Pelagius (see Pelagius, Pelagianism), who sought to lead souls to a better life by reminding them of their innate, inalienable power. Man shall acknowledge to himself powers of will and "spiritual riches," "which he shall then be able to employ well when he shall have learned that he has them." The motive force in Augustine's development of the doctrine was not the theory or the practise of the Church, but his personal experience of sin and grace. According to his system, the decisive and inalienable characteristic of man is not abstract freedom of choice but loving union with God (*Expositio Psalmorum*, v.; Eng. transl., *NPNF*, 1 ser., viii. 11–15; *Conf.*, I., i. 1, VII., x. 16; Eng. transl., viii. 45, 109–110). Without divine aid (enabling power, *adjutorium*), transcending natural moral powers, even Adam could not remain good, though this aid gives only the possibility, not the realization, of fellowship with God (*De natura et gratia*, xlviii. 56; Eng. transl., v. 140; *De correptione et gratia*, xi. 32; cf. x. 27; xii. 34, 38; Eng. transl., v. 482–487). God gave first a good will to man, in which, however, he could not continue without the gift of enabling power; and that man should be willing to continue God left to his free will. This free will is inherent in human personality, nor can man, from the point of view of love, be considered as acting under compulsion, so that the guilt of sin falls on him alone (*De gratia et libero arbitrio*, ii. 4, xviii. 37; Eng. transl., v. 445, 459). This delivers his idea of free will from pantheistic naturalism; on the other hand, his religious interest will not permit him to emancipate free will from God. Hence, initial will is rather a divine content for its further development, by which it wins its freedom in a higher sense as an autonomous agent in the sphere of life. The lower form of freedom was but a transition point to true freedom (xi. 32, xii. 33; cf. x. 28; Eng. transl., v. 484–485; *De prædestinatione sanctorum*, xv. 30; Eng. transl., v. 505–506). From the sin of Adam, in virtue of the unity of the human race, arose the necessity for the condemnation of all mankind ("mass of perdition"), salvation being possible only through the second Adam, Christ, for all united with him (*Contra duas epistolas Pelagianorum*, IV., iv. 7; Eng. transl., v. 419; *De correptione et gratia*, x. 26, 28; Eng. transl., v. 183; *De natura et gratia*, v. 5; Eng. transl., v. 123). This historic dispensation of salvation is carried out so rigidly that even the patriarchs were saved only by the sight of the risen Christ on whom they believed (*De peccato originali*, xxvi. 30–31; Eng. transl., v.

248). The Church of all ages, historically founded on Christ, hides the elect within itself, unlike the lost world (*De civitate Dei*, xv. 1; Eng. transl., ii. 284). In the empiric admission to "the body of Christ," set forth already in the reception of infant baptism (*De natura et gratia*, viii. 9; Eng. transl., v. 124), God's free dispensation to his elect discloses itself (*De correptione et gratia*, viii. 42; Eng. transl., v. 489). In his writings on predestination Augustine considers, for the most part, only those whom the grace of God leads to his kingdom of their own free will; and even the Church is the body of the elect only in a general sense, since it contains "vessels to honor" and "vessels to dishonor," the latter not belonging fully to the Church (*De baptismo*, VII., li. 99). The basis of the idea that election is not accomplished merely by external incorporation into the Church, but fulfils itself finally by the personal operation of grace, was afforded by the experience of "grace free but not freed" (*De correptione et gratia*, xiii. 41–42; Eng. transl., v. 488–489), and the formally free will must, therefore, be filled with good (*De gratia et libero arbitrio*, xv. 31; Eng. transl., v. 456–457). By his experience of conversion Augustine found his free will instantly, whereby he submitted absolutely in divine service (*Conf.*, ix. 1; Eng. transl., i. 129). From which the conclusion follows that "the human will does not attain grace by freedom, but rather freedom by grace" (*De correptione et gratia*, viii. 17; Eng. transl., v. 478). Faith is especially, from first to last, the work of God in man, so that "the elect are not elected because they believe, but they are elected that they may believe" (*De prædestinatione sanctorum*, viii. 16, xvii. 34; cf. ii. 3–4, xx. 40; Eng. transl., v. 506, 514–515, 499, 517–518). God chose a "certain number" from the "mass of perdition" (*De correptione et gratia*, x. 26, xiii. 39; cf. vii. 12; Eng. transl., v. 482, 487–488, 476; *De dono perseverantiæ*, xiv. 35; Eng. transl., v. 539; *De prædestinatione sanctorum*, xii. 23; Eng. transl., v. 509). For Augustine there is thus a division only on the whole, never with reference to individual persons. The former sense of foreknowledge continues, but now comes to be applied to God's own operations of grace, not to human resolves (xiv. 31, xix. 38), and, so far as the elect are concerned, foreknowledge is thus identical with predestination (*De dono perseverantiæ*, xix. 47–48; Eng. transl., v. 545). As to the others, emphasis on the elect relieved the necessity of mentioning the non-elect. "Predestination can not exist without foreknowledge, although foreknowledge may exist without predestination" (*De prædestinatione sanctorum*, x. 19; Eng. transl., v. 507). This distinction steers clear of supralapsarianism even as to the fall; for God foreknew the fall of Adam, but did not compel it (*De correptione et gratia*, xii. 37; Eng. transl., v. 487). After the fall, the non-elect were simply left in the "mass of perdition," from which no one had any claim to be saved (*De gratia et libero arbitrio*, xxi. 42–43, xxiii. 45; cf. *De correptione et gratia*, xiii. 42; *De dono perseverantiæ*, xiii. 33; Eng. transl., v. 462–463, 489, 538). These variants of emphasis spring from Augustine's fundamental postulate that all good is of God and all evil of free will, a view aided by his Platonic notion that evil is essentially a defect, the "not-being" (*De libero arbitrio*, II., xx. 54). Later in the development of Augustine's thought he was able to postulate predestination to destruction, even if not to sin (*Enchiridion*, c.; Eng. transl., iii. 269; cf. *De civitate Dei*, XXII., xxiv. 5; Eng. transl., ii. 504). I Tim. ii. 4 means that God does not will that every man be saved, but that no man is saved apart from his will, and "all men" refers to the whole race in its varieties (*Enchiridion*, ciii.; Eng. transl., iii. 269). The carrying-out of the counsel of grace to the elect is secured by admonitory preaching (*De correptione et gratia*, vii. 13; Eng. transl., v. 477). This entire treatise aims to prove that the general historical and the individual operations of grace are not mutually exclusive (xiv. 43; Eng. transl., v. 489); hence room is left for free moral activity to such an extent that Augustine repeatedly speaks of "merits" though these rest, in the last analysis, on divine activity (e.g., *De gratia et libero arbitrio*, vi. 15; Eng. transl., v. 450). The "grace" of Augustine is a divine power to which man owes moral "vivification" or "infusion of love," of which remission of sins appears to be a natural concomitant (cf. *De gratia et libero arbitrio*, xi. 23–24; Eng. transl., v. 453–454). Behind human preaching God's secret instruction works on the elect (*De prædestinatione sanctorum*, viii. 13; Eng. transl., v. 504–505). In view of the guidance in experience of the elect, Augustine distinguishes various degrees of grace (*De gratia et libero arbitrio*, xvii. 33; Eng. transl., v. 457–458); the aid to those in divine communion exceeds the first enabling power as actuality surpasses possibility. Not only can human will resist the divine will (*De correptione et gratia*, xiv. 45; Eng. transl., v. 489–490), but God alone grants the gift of perseverance to his elect (*De dono perseverantiæ*, i. 1; Eng. transl., v. 526), who, without this gift, are not truly elect (*De correptione et gratia*, vii. 14, ix. 20–21, xii. 36; *De prædestinatione sanctorum*, xvi. 32; Eng. transl., v. 477, 479–480, 486, 513).

While the authority of Augustine, combined with the deeper character of the Western doctrine of grace, easily overthrew Pelagianism, so that even the Semipelagians (see SEMIPELAGIANISM) disowned the anathematized heresies of Pelagius, Augustine's doctrine of predestination fell far short of acceptance.

4. Post-Augustinian Views.

Jerome, Hilary, and Faustus of Riez (qq.v.) adhered to free will, nor did the Semi-Pelagians make it clear that admission to Christianity through baptism, regarded as necessary to salvation, signified predestination. Later followers of Augustine seem to have reduced the operation of grace as based on divine election to this point, for the Synod of Orange (q.v.) in 529 (Mansi, *Concilia*, viii. 735 sqq.), in effect, denied a predestined reprobation in connection with its commitment on the grace of baptism, affirming that the divine election had designed no division among the baptized. Although an essential thought of Augustine was thus sacrificed, yet the way was opened to reunite on the middle ground represented by the old theory of foreknowledge which was facilitated for the followers of Augustine in that he had never formally assailed

the traditional teaching of foreknowledge. The new content he had given the older doctrine was by no means firmly established, so that later it could be affirmed much more emphatically than by Augustine himself that foreknowledge of evil was not a predestination "imposed by necessity upon the human will" (Fulgentius of Ruspe, *Ad Monimum*, i. 7; *MPL*, lxv. 157). Except for a number of obscure deviations, no new concepts were developed during the succeeding centuries. On the Augustinian side the only event of interest was the attempt of the unknown author of the fifth century *De vocatione omnium gentium* (cf. *MPL*, li. 664 sqq.) to reconcile the particularism of election with a serious universalism of the will to save, and by faith he rose superior to the paradox that God alone works salvation and gives it to all men, though all are not saved. On the opposing side certain passages of *Liber prædestinatus* (iii. 1; *MPL*, liii. 629–632; see PRÆDESTINATUS, LIBER) mark the first attempt to refer predestination from human persons to the general plan of salvation. A new factor first entered into the controversy in the ninth century with Gottschalk (see GOTTSCHALK, 1). His formula of a twofold predestination applying equally to those who had thus far been distinguished as "foreordained" and "foreknown," however disturbing to theologians who officially recognized Augustine but were far from sharing his views, was, nevertheless, a reproduction of Augustine's own theory. Even for his supralapsarianism he could appeal not only to Augustine (*ut sup.*) but also to Fulgentius (*De veritate prædestinationis*, iii. 5) and to the declaration of Isidore of Seville (*Sent.* II., vi. 1; *MPL*, lxxxiii. 606): "there is a twofold predestination, of the elect to blessedness, and of the reprobate to death." Gottschalk's theological views, however, would scarcely have brought condemnation upon him had he not employed the doctrine of predestination, in connection with his own experience, to assert the independence of the inner man from the Church. The numerous followers of Augustine who gave Gottschalk literary support did not accept the doctrine of the assurance of salvation, so that Ratramnus (q.v.), like Augustine, maintained that no man might presume to consider himself one of the elect (*De prædestinatione*, ii.). In the mass of writings produced at this period the sole new element is the multiplication of ambiguous formulas with which each one sought to make his own divergent opinions pass as Augustinian. A master of this type was Hincmar of Reims (q.v.), who emphasized, in the theses of the Synod of Chiersey (853), the universality of salvation, but as regards free will and predestination advanced Semipelagian views in Augustinian terminology, affirming that "God elects from the mass of perdition after his foreknowledge those whom through grace he predestined to life; others, moreover, whom he abandons in the mass of perdition, by a just judgment, he foreknew would perish but did not predestine that they should perish" (cf. Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, iv., 217–218). Rabanus Maurus (q.v.) declared that "God does not predestine all that he foreknows; for he only foreknows evil, he does not predestine it; but good he both foreknows and predestines" (*Epist. ad Notingum*, *MPL*, cxii. 1532–33). At the same time he openly expressed Semipelagian views on free will (*ut sup.*, pp. 1541, 1553; *Epist. ad Hincmarum*, p. 1524). In the controversy only resolute Augustinians spoke in unmistakable terms, although the most of them had changed the Augustinian point of view. The interest is no longer in the anthropomorphic problem, admitting of various irreconcilable views, but in the construction of a simple, speculative formula of God. Gottschalk manifests a decided tendency to determinism, wishing to avoid foreknowledge in the formulation of a conception of God immutable, a trend found in milder form in Ratramnus (*De prædestinatione*, ii.), who applies the twofold predestination of God simply to his all-embracing government of the world. On this scheme, which now appeared to receive a pantheistic application, Scotus Erigena (q.v.) based his *De prædestinatione*, though in fact he agreed far more with Gottschalk's determinism than with the current Semipelagianism.

The Gottschalk controversy ended with the transformation of a vital problem into a scholastic theory, a character which was retained throughout the Middle Ages. During the following

5. Scholastic Theology.

centuries the prevailing doctrine, while carefully avoiding both Semipelagian terms and the extreme deductions of Augustinianism (irresistible grace and perseverance), exalted the operation of grace alone and constantly repeated the formulas of Augustine on foreknowledge and predestination to good, but mere foreknowledge of evil (Anselm, *De concordia præscientiæ prædestinationis cum libero arbitrio*, i. 7; *MPL*, clviii. 517; Peter Lombard, *Sent.* I., xl. 1, 4; *MPL*, cxcii. 631; Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*, I., xxiii. 5). At the same time it was held, with Augustine, that the will of fallen man remained free, but was made and maintained good only by grace, the gift of God (Anselm, *ut sup.*, iii. 3–4; Bernard of Clairvaux, *De gratia et libero arbitrio*, xiv. 46–47, *MPL*, clxxxii. 1026–27; Peter Lombard, *ut sup.*, II., xxviii. 4; Thomas Aquinas, *ut sup.*, I., cv. 4). This would indicate thoroughgoing predestinarianism, were it not for a sentence of Bernard (*ut sup.*, x. 35) according to which those fallen in this life by their free will may be saved by divine aid, but not after the resurrection. Since, however, perseverance was now placed in the future life, it became possible not only for Adam but for the elect even to fall from grace; and the Augustinian doctrine of two forms of divine aid (possibility and actuality; *ut sup.*) was disregarded. From this view only Thomas Aquinas is to be excepted, and his more deterministic position (cf. *Summa*, I., xxiii. 7) henceforth was the pillar of genuine Augustinianism. A complete change was inaugurated by Duns Scotus (q.v.) whose widely divergent expressions on predestination can be explained only on the assumption of an equally justifiable twofold point of view. The will is by nature the sole cause of its own acts, so that even God does not work immediately on the human will (*Sent.*, II., xxv. 2, xxxvii. 2, 8, III., iii. 21); therefore, the will of God, being determined by nothing beyond itself, is the

ultimate cause of everything that happens in the universe and of human fortunes. Duns Scotus gave the first impulse to the undisguised "Pelagianism" of the late Middle Ages with his doctrines of "merit of the fit" and "act of love," which would tend to shift all back to foreknowledge. By his emphasis on the absolute freedom of the divine will he furnished weapons for the uncompromising opponents of this entire development. During the centuries immediately preceding the Reformation the status of the doctrine of grace was but superficial, except where the profounder view was guarded by the Augustinian friars. Early in the fourteenth century, the Thomist Thomas Bradwardine (q.v.) assailed Pelagianism, and was followed by John Wyclif (q.v.), an Augustinian of the most deterministic type, who identified the "true Church" with the "number of the predestined" (*De ecclesia*, i.) and denied that the pope could be the head of such a body since "without special revelation" he could not even know whether he was a member of it.

6. Later Roman Catholic View.

The teaching of the Roman Catholic Church on predestination was unchanged by the Reformation. In its doctrine of grace the Council of Trent returned to the position of earlier scholasticism (vi. 5, 16), but as regards predestination contented itself with warding off deductions perilous to the Church (vi. 9 sqq.). The doctrine itself remained fundamentally undecided, so that toward the end of the sixteenth century a controversy could break out between the Thomistic Dominicans and the Semipelagian Jesuits. A Congregatio de auxiliis gratiæ sat for nine years without being able to condemn either party as heretical. When, however, in the following century Jansenism renewed the unabridged teachings of Augustine, the papal condemnations of Jansen (see JANSEN, CORNELIUS, JANSENISM) and Pasquier Quesnel (q.v.) not only rejected the doctrine of possible salvation independent of the Church, but also a series of genuine Augustinian concepts, such as irresistible grace. In recent years there has been an unmistakable tendency toward the Semipelagian Jesuit position. It is held, with tacit recommendation of the theory of foreknowledge, that "the Church never wishes to resolve that controversy; each one, therefore, may without impairing the faith hold that opinion which appears more probable and seems to aid the better in resolving the difficulties of unbelievers and heretics" (G. Perrone, *Prælectiones theologicæ*, 47th ed., Turin, 1896.)

7. The Reformers.

In the early days of Protestantism, predestination, as the expression of the power of grace from personal experience, opposed individual certainty of salvation to the claims of the Church, and formed the one central dogma common to all the Reformers. Before beginning his career as a Reformer, Luther had expressed an Augustinianism which theoretically opposed the rigid deductions of the system; but later he passed far beyond the position of Augustine to an actual supralapsarianism which regarded even the fall of Adam as divinely decreed. He included in the nature of man, or the enabling grace of Augustine, not only possible but actual union with God. For the theoretic maintenance of this position there was at hand the doctrine of the absoluteness of the divine will, as posited not only by Duns Scotus and the nominalists who followed him, but also by Laurentius Valla and (for Zwingli) by the mystic pantheist Pico della Mirandola (see PICO DELLA MIRANDOLA, GIOVANNI). The argument was, accordingly, carried not only from the empirical servitude of the sinful will to the all-efficient grace of God, but also from the all-comprehending activity of God to the inconceivability of free will. All the Reformers proceeded from the assumption that this doctrine alone was in harmony with a truly living faith. Luther was led to make a systematic presentation of his doctrine of predestination by the *De libero arbitrio* of Erasmus (Basel, 1524), to which he replied in his *De servo arbitrio* (Wittenberg, 1525). Without these predecessors, Zwingli would scarcely have advanced extreme views in his *Anamnema de providentia Dei* (1530). Starting from the postulates that God, as the unchangeable good and infinite power, reigns by his providence throughout all that transpires in the universe, he affirmed that man is not different from nature by having an undetermined will, but by a capability of knowing God and entering into fellowship with him. Such knowledge is realized in the irrevocable law which is the expression of the divine will. The law, however, can not overcome the conflict of spirit and flesh, because of which man had to fall, but only discloses it. It follows that the fall was necessary to the complete divine revelation. God did not merely foresee but caused it. This act was not revolting to God's ethical being; for he is above law. God's goodness manifested itself first in the fall but especially in salvation. Should election be based on foreknowledge (which is excluded) God would be degraded into man. Luther's later views display the fact that the newly acquired faith did not explain the qualities of the regenerate by the almighty working of divine grace but realized the grace of God, through the preaching of the words of promise. As a matter of fact, however, Luther's type of faith, based on the Scriptures and the sacraments, often emphasized the objective efficiency of the means of grace in such a way as would ultimately undermine the dogma of predestination. Zwingli, on the other hand, derived the assurance of salvation not merely through the preaching of the Word, but also through the efficacious Word; that is, through the personal life of faith awakened by God. Though he was thus led to depreciate the means of grace, the doctrine of predestination with him and his successors remained more permanently associated with the consciousness of faith. The divergent estimate attached to the external means of grace, moreover, caused Zwingli to weaken the bounds of the Church, so that he could teach the salvation of certain heathen and of unbaptized children dying in infancy; while the identification of the "invisible Church" with the elect, only occasionally made by Luther, formed an important element of his theology. Luther's doctrine of predestination underlies

his Catechism (ii. 3) and the Augsburg Confession (arts. v., xix.); but the *Confessio variata* of 1540 effaced these traces, and after 1532 Melanchthon taught a synergistic and universalistic system, with special endeavor to save the seriousness of preaching unto salvation. Of the more important theologians of the century, however, he was followed only by the Reformed Johannes à Lasco (q.v.), who, however, adopted Zwingli's views on the salvation of unbaptized children. Meanwhile the man had appeared who was to make predestination the necessary basis of belief for those who should follow him. The teachings of John Calvin (q.v.) on election are only what may be found scattered in Martin Butzer's commentaries, but his systematic ability enabled him to weave these elements into a doctrine, and to connect them indissolubly with the foundations of Protestantism. His very avoidance of paradoxical speculation and his rigid determination to adhere strictly to the Bible made his doctrine an immovable pillar of the system. Presented skilfully as a support of the doctrine of justification, yet it rests securely in his fundamental premise of the divine glory. Calvin is far removed from Zwingli who, somewhat close to the pantheists, postulates an a priori necessity to sin for the glory of God; but he finds that to set forth God's glory rejection must follow no less than election. Though nearer to Augustine than Luther on the original state, yet he maintains supralapsarianism (*Institutes*, I., xv. 8, III., xxiii. 8). The absolute decree, irresistible grace, and the gift of perseverance are prominent (III., xxi. 5). He shares with Zwingli the need of the certainty of salvation in the personal life which dispenses with an objectivity of the means of grace in the Lutheran sense of the term. God operates through them " in an orderly way," their efficacy being due to the working of the divine spirit, with the resulting formula that the means of salvation are efficacious only to the elect. The Christian who would be assured of his salvation must, therefore, test the operation of the Word in himself (III., xxiv. 4), so that both practically and theoretically belief in election serves to awaken living faith and to elevate the moral nature (III., xxiii. 12, xxiv. 5) The actual members of the Church are, of course, only the elect.

In the Reformed confessions of the sixteenth century the doctrine of election was set forth both in harsh (*Confession de foi*, 1559) and in mild form (H. Bullinger's *Confessio Helvetica posterior*, art. x., 1562), or presupposed in their practical consequences (Heidelberg Catechism, 53–54, 86). For several decades there were no controversies with the Lutherans, nor was it until the struggle between Johann Marbach and Hieronymus Zanchi (qq.v.) at Strasburg in 1561 that the Gnesio-Lutherans were found to have deviated from Luther. Two years later the Formula of Concord (q.v.) was drawn up, positing the universality of the divine promises, the necessity of moral endeavor, and election as the foundation of faith, betraying only by a single word that the doctrine of the perseverance of the elect had been abandoned. On these affirmations is constructed the eleventh article of the Formula of Concord, which, aiming to set limits to various tendencies, declares that election is not based on the foreknowledge of faith, and, on the other side, that the earnestness of the " universal promise " admits of no hidden will of God at variance with his revealed will. At the same time no universal purpose of salvation to include every individual is implied; the heathen are doomed to just judgment, and only where God causes his Word to be preached is it intended for all. The elect are all those placed by baptism in the state of grace, though it is possible afterward to lapse. Real predestination doctrine vanishes and the objectivity of the means of grace only serves to cloak a refined synergism. In the Reformed Church, the synergism of the Arminians (q.v.) led to a reaffirmation of the doctrine at the Synod of Dort (q.v.), where it also became evident how indissolubly the historical Reformed mode of faith had become one with this fundamental element. The harshness of its deductions, however, called for modifications, not only in Germany, but also on genuinely Calvinistic soil. While Theodore Beza (q.v.) had far overleaped Calvin by declaring (*Quæstiones theologicæ*, i. 108, 1580) that " predestination is an eternal and immutable decree whereby he [God] determined to be glorified by saving some in Christ by mere grace, and by damning others in Adam and by his own just judgment," the school of Saumur, on the other hand, began to develop the ethical side of Calvinism, the " hypothetical universalism " of Moïse Amyraut (q.v.; see also PAJON, CLAUDE), which had absolutely no connection with the theory of foreknowledge, at least leaving the foundations of religious experience entirely unassailed. The harsh antithesis of the Helvetic Consensus Formula (q.v.) in 1675 was shortlived. In England the Thirty-Nine Articles (q.v.) set forth the doctrine of election clearly and mildly, without allusion to reprobation; nor was the attempt to give official sanction to the harsh Calvinism of the Lambeth Articles (q.v.) of 1595 successful. The latter, however, were practically incorporated in the Westminster Confession of 1647; but even in Calvinistic circles the logical deductions of the system have been felt oppressive, so that in 1903 the Presbyterians of the United States introduced certain modifications of statement into the Westminster Confession, which left that document essentially unaltered, yet declared the faith of the Church in the all-embracing love of God, the election of children dying in infancy, and the duty of missionary activity (cf. *Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A.*, 1903, pp. 124 sqq., where the changes and additions are given in official form). See CALVINISM. (E. F. KARL MÜLLER.)

8. Post-Reformation History.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Material on the Biblical side of the subject is to be sought in the commentaries on the passages cited, especially that of Meyer, and in the works named in and under BIBLICAL THEOLOGY, particularly those of Dillmann, Schultz, Bennett, Smend, and Davidson on the O. T., and Beyschlag, Weiss, Adeney, Stevens, and Gould on the N. T. Consult further: B. Weiss, in *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*, 1857; O. Pfleiderer, *Der Paulinismus*, Leipsic, 1873, Eng. transl., London, 1877; E. Menégoz, *La Prédestination dans la théologie paulinienne*, Paris, 1884; V. Weber, *Kritische Geschichte der Exegese des Römerbriefes*, Würzburg, 1888; K. Müller, *Die göttliche*

Zuvorersehung und Erwählung nach dem Evangelium des Paulus, Halle, 1892; J. Dalmer, *Die Erwählung Israels nach der Heilsverkundigung des Paulus*, Gütersloh, 1894; F. L. Steinmeyer, *Studien über den Brief des Paulus an die Römer*, vol. i., Berlin, 1894; O. K. A. Holtzmann, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, Freiburg, 1895; W. Beyschlag, *Die paulinische Theodicee, Rom. 9–11*, 2d ed., Halle, 1896; E. Kühl, *Zur paulinischen Theodicee*, Göttingen, 1897.

For the history of the doctrine consult the works under Doctrine, History of, especially those of Shedd, Sheldon, Thomasius, Hagenbach, Harnack, Seeberg, and Fisher. Also the literature under Augustine, Saint, of Hippo; Calvin, John; Pelagianism; and Zwingli, Huldreich. Consult further: J. G. Walch, *Miscellanea sacra*, pp. 575 sqq., Amsterdam, 1744; G. F. Wiggers, *Pragmatische Darstellung des Augustinismus und Pelagianismus*, 2 parts, Hamburg, 1833; F. Worter, *Die christliche Lehre von Gnade und Dreiheit . bis auf Augustinus*, Freiburg, 1856; idem, *Der Pelagianismus*, 2d ed., ib., 1874; idem, *Zur Dogmengeschichte des Semipelagianismus*, Paderborn, 1898; F. Kattenbusch, *Luthers Lehre von unfreien Willen*, Göttingen, 1875; J. B. Mozley, *A Treatise on the Augustinian Doctrine of Predestination*, 2d ed., London, 1878; F. Klasen, *Die innere Entwickelung des Pelagianismus*, Freiburg, 1882; K. Werner, *Die Scholastik des späteren Mittelalters*, Vienna, 1883 sqq.; Dieckhoff, *Der missourische Prädestinationismus*, Rostock, 1885; H. Reuter, *Augustinische Studien*, Gotha, 1887; M. Stauh, *Das Verhältnis der menschlichen Willensfreiheit zur Gotteslehre bei Luther und Zwingli*, Zurich, 1894; M. Scheibe, *Calvins Prädestinationslehre*, Halle, 1897; A. Lang, *Der Evangelienkommentar M. Butzers*, Leipsic, 1900; R. Seeberg, *Die Theologie des Duns Scotus*, ib., 1900; F. H. Foster, in S. M. Jackson, *Huldreich Zwingli*, pp. 382 sqq., New York, 1903; K. Müller, *Die Bekenntnisschriften der reformierten Kirche*, Leipsic, 1903; H. von Schubert, *Der sogenannte Prödestinatus*, ib., 1903; W. Walker, *John Calvin*, New York, 1906.

The doctrine is discussed on the dogmatic side in the manuals of theology (cf. Calvinism; Doctrine, History of; and Dogma, Dogmatics, where the authors, titles, and dates are given), especially the works by Kuyper, Warfield, Hodge, Shedd, Beckwith, Stearns, Sheldon, Martensen, Geierman, Wilhelm, and Scannell (the last two are Roman Catholic). Consult further: D. Whithy, *A Discourse on the Five Points: Election . .*, London, 1817; J. Kelly, *The Eternal Purpose of God in Christ Jesus Our Lord*, London, 1840; N. L. Rice, *God Sovereign and Man Free; or, the Doctrine of Divine Foreordination*, Philadelphia, 1850; S. D. Clarke, *The Utility and Glory of God's Immutable Purposes*, Boston, 1860; A. Schweizer, *Die protestantischen Centraldogmen*, Zurich, 1854–56; J. Forbes, *Predestination and Free Will* and *The Westminster Confession of Faith*, Edinburgh, 1878; J. L. Girardeau, *Calvinism and Evangelical Arminianism; compared as to Election, Reprobation . . and Related Doctrines*, Columbia, 1890; S. Cox, *The Hebrew Twins: A Vindication of God's Ways with Jacob and Esau*, London, 1894; J. S. Dodge, *The Purpose of God*, Boston, 1894; E. F. Wyneken, *Das Naturgesetz der Seele und die menschliche Freiheit*, Heidelherg, 1906.

PREGER, prê'ger, **JOHANN WILHELM:** German Lutheran; b. at Schweinfurt (70 m. e. of Frankfort) Aug. 25, 1827; d. at Munich Jan. 30, 1896. He studied at Erlangen 1845–49, and at Berlin 1850; and in 1851 he was called as city vicar and professor of Protestant religious instruction and history in the student institutions at Munich, becoming gymnasial professor in 1868. For seventeen years he gave instruction in religion in the commercial schools there, his duties being modified when there was a change made in the direction of the school curriculum. During forty-five years of service at Munich, he developed a many-sided activity and yet found time for important literary labors. His *Geschichte der Lehre vom geistlichen Amte* (Nördlingen, 1857) was evoked by W Löhe's *Kirche und Amt* (Erlangen, 1851) and T. Kliefoth's *Acht Bücher von der Kirche* (Halle, 1857), and develops the thought that the doctrine of the ministerial office depends upon the doctrine of justification. His next work was *M. Flacius Illyricus und seine Zeit* (2 vols., Erlangen, 1859–61), historical and impartial in aim. The following years were occupied with preliminary studies for the great work of his life, *Geschichte der deutschen Mystik im Mittelalter* (3 vols., Leipsic, 1874–93). The chief personages dealt with are Eckhart, Suso, and Tauler, but the study embraces the lesser lights. A fourth volume was projected but did not appear. In preparation of this work a large number of preliminary studies found entrance into various journals and reviews (list in Hauck-Herzog, *RE*, xvi. 2). He wrote also, among other works, a *Lehrbuch der bayrischen Geschichte* (Erlangen, 1864) which passed through many editions; *Luthers Tischreden aus den Jahren 1531–32* (1888); and *Ueber die Verfassung der französischen Waldesier in der alten Zeit* (1890).

He was a man of wide knowledge and interests, receptive and courteous toward the opinions of others, a clear-minded teacher who won the regard of his pupils, and a helpful worker in ecclesiastical circles. (W Caspari.)

Bibliography: The memorial addresses at the grave were by Kelber and Von Stählin, Munich, 1896; a memoir by Cornelius is in *SMA*, 1896; and T. Kolde's trihute is in *Beiträge zur bayerischen Kirchengeschichte*, 1896.

PREGIZERIANS: A German religious sect taking its name from Christian Gottlob Pregizer (b. at Stuttgart Mar. 18, 1751; d. at Haiterbach, 30 m. s.w. of Stuttgart, Oct. 30, 1824). At first rigidly ascetic, he became known as a powerful revivalist while preacher in the Schlosskirche in Tübingen. In his first pastorate at Grafenberg (1783–95) he seems to have been under the influence of theosophical pietism and was coolly received by his congregation. When, however, he became pastor at Haiterbach in 1795, he inaugurated a profound movement among the congregations of the vicinity. Conventicles arose here and there, several of them under his own leadership. After 1801 he became associated with the so-called " Blessed Ones " who arose in the last decade of the eighteenth century in the valley of the Rems and the Schwarzwald, and who, rejecting the new hymnal of 1791, sang the old hymns to merry popular tunes with appropriate instrumental music. In opposition both to the moralism of the Enlightenment (q.v.) and to the doctrine of sanctification taught by Johann Michael Hahn (q.v.), they laid an exaggerated stress on justification by faith. The excesses of his followers caused Pregizer to be summoned before the consistory in 1808, but although his somewhat ambiguous explanations were not wholly satisfactory, no ground could be found for proceeding against him. His conduct and mode of life were blameless; he did not teach the sinlessness of those who had found grace; and he so strenuously opposed the anti-ecclesiastical and antinomian tendencies of his followers that the extremists among them turned away from him.

The sect expanded after Pregizer's death, but there was a distinct lack of leaders. The moral excesses of the Pregizerians became so great that police interference was necessary. Gradually, how-

ever, a small body of nobler type broke off from the main sect, rejected all vagaries, and evolved views on justification and baptism along the lines marked out by Luther. The cardinal tenet of Pregizerianism centers in justification, which occurs once and for all in each individual, and which is essentially connected with baptism. The Christian must ever be joyful because of the grace which he has experienced, and the Pregizerians were, accordingly, often called "Hurrah Christians" (*Juchhe-Christen*), or, because of their belief in ictic conversion, "Galloping Christians" (*Galopp-Christen*). They also taught that there is no sin and that confession and penance are unnecessary; they disregarded the Sabbath and manifested other antinomian tendencies; and they practically rejected the Lutheran Church. They were chiliasts and restorationists, but refused to take any part in either foreign or domestic missions. The only official source for a knowledge of the doctrines of the sect is the *Sammlung geistlicher Lieder zum Gebrauch für gläubige Kinder Gottes*, to which is appended Pregizer's confession of faith.

There are still about eighty Pregizerian communities in Württemberg and Baden, though their number is steadily diminishing. Extravagances have been abandoned, but they retain their joyous characteristics. They are marked by Lutheran piety and use Luther's writings along with the Bible. They are for the most part faithful to the Lutheran Church, and are united by a conference held thrice annually at various places in Württemberg. (C. Kolb.)

Bibliography: Grüneisen, in *ZHT*, 1841; C. Palmer, *Die Gemeinschaften und Sekten Württembergs*, Tübingen, 1877; C. Dietrich and F. Brockes, *Die Privat-Erbauungsgemeinschaften innerhalb der evangelischen Kirche Deutschlands*, Stuttgart, 1903.

PRELATE: The title of certain ecclesiastical dignitaries. Canon law classifies church offices as "major and minor benefices." To the former belong those which carry power of administration, and the occupants are termed prelates. Strictly, this category covers only the pope, patriarchs, primates, archbishops, and bishops. Among prelates of the second order are reckoned cardinals, legates, and nuncios; prelates of the Curia, exempt or privileged abbots, provosts, and deans of chapters.

Of particular importance are the prelates of the Curia, ecclesiastics who exercise functions of the pontifical government proper. These also enjoy a peculiarly honorable precedence, have the title "Monsignore," and may wear violet apparel, exercising these privileges as honorary prelates, but taking no part in actual jurisdiction (cf. J. H. Bangen, *Die römische Kurie*, Munich, 1854). Admission to the prelacy, which is viewed as a first step to the cardinalate, is attended with certain conditions, such as a stated age of twenty-five years, five years of legal study at a university, possession of the degree of *doctor utriusque juris*, two years of legal practise at a spiritual tribunal, and formal examination before the Signatura justitiæ. In behalf of special training for the prelacy, Benedict XIV founded the Academia ecclesiastica. See Prelature. E. Sehling.

PRELATURE: A name originally and strictly applied to an ecclesiastical office carrying with it jurisdiction exercised in the name of the incumbent. These dignities are divided into three classes: (1) those possessed by all diocesan bishops, but not by coadjutor or titular bishops; (2) those to which the dignity was later attached by a special act, including cardinals, papal legates and nuncios, the medieval archdeacons and archpriests, and the heads of collegiate foundations, abbeys, and knightly orders in the cases when they were exempt from episcopal jurisdiction and endowed with a quasi-episcopal jurisdiction of their own; (3) the provosts and deans of chapters in so far as during the Middle Ages, as archdeacons, they had acquired a certain jurisdiction of their own, after the loss of which they still claimed the rank and title. Nowadays both rank and title are given by the pope to a large number of actual or nominal officials of the Curia who possess no jurisdiction. Prelates are distinguished by special titles and dress, and by the right of being received with incense on their formal entrance into a church. See Prelate.

(O. Mejer†.)

PREMILLENARIANISM. See Millennium, Millenarianism, §§ 10–11.

PREMONSTRATENSIANS (NORBERTINES, WHITE CANONS): An order of regular canons, combining as their object personal holiness, preaching, and living according to the so-called rule of Augustine. Their founder was St. Norbert (b. at Xanten, 15 m. s.e. of Cleves, 1080–82; d. at Magdeburg June 6, 1134). Being the second son of Count Herbert of Lennep, according to contemporary custom in a noble family he was destined from birth for the spiritual career and obtained a canonry in the chapter of St. Victor, at Xanten. Being transferred to the archiepiscopal see of Cologne, he passed thence into the chancery of Emperor Henry V to whom he was related on the paternal side. He accompanied the emperor on his expedition to Rome in 1111, and witnessed the arrest of Pope Paschal II. Having been struck by lightning near Wreden in Westphalia, he resolved to renounce worldly enjoyment and to apply himself to the earnest preaching of penance. After a brief sojourn in the cloister of Siegburg near Bonn he was ordained priest, in 1115, by Archbishop Frederick I. of Cologne. Utterly failing in his attempt to reform the canons of St. Victor, Norbert seems to have traveled about the vicinity of Xanten as a preacher of penance and was accused before the papal legate, Cuno of Praeneste, at the synod of Fritzlar, in July, 1118, of preaching without a commission and call. This hostility opened his eyes to the necessity of seeking another scene for his activity, and of securing papal sanction. He now cast himself in dependence upon the pope, laid down his benefices, and entered upon his mendicant journeys. In Nov., 1118, he met Pope Gelasius II. at St. Gilles in the diocese of Nîmes, who authorized him to preach. He now traversed France as a proclaimer of penance, and arrived at Valenciennes in the

The Founder.

spring of 1119, where he won his most faithful companion, Hugo de Fosses.

At the Synod of Reims, in 1119, Norbert had a conference with Pope Calixtus II., but the papal assent to his preaching was not renewed. He now conceived the idea of a model school for the training of clericals according to strict ascetic rule, which, in 1120, he founded in the forest of Coucy, in the diocese of Laon, department of Aisne, and called it Premonstratum (" foreshown "), for he believed that God had shown him the vision of a new monastery. In that year he and Hugo received the white habit from his friend the bishop, and soon after he gave his followers, increased to thirteen, the rule of Augustine and established them as regular canons. In Germany he induced Count Godfrey of Kappenberg, in 1122, to convert his opulent ancestral castle into a cloister of Norbertines. In 1124, Norbert was called to Antwerp, where, by founding a cloister, he was able to withdraw the people from the influence of the heretic Tanchelm (q.v.); and on Feb. 16, 1126, at Rome he obtained of Pope Honorius II. the confirmation of his order. In 1126 he was elected archbishop of Magdeburg. Barefoot, a preacher whom the multitude admired as a saint by reason of his austerity, Norbert made his entrance and was consecrated and enthroned on July 25, 1126. An ecclesiastical zealot and stern ascetic, he began to rule with strictness; and exerted himself with encroaching zeal to replace the former incumbents of the best foundations with Premonstratensians, arousing particular displeasure in the instance of the Church of St. Mary at Magdeburg in 1129. He was canonized by Gregory XIII. in 1582.

Founding of the Order.

The Congregation founded by Norbert was a closed order after the plan of organization of the Cistercians; but differing from them by following the rule of Augustine, together with statutes largely borrowed by Norbert from the articles of the Parisian Congregation of St. Victor. From these institutions of the Premonstratensians were later taken literally the provisions of the Dominican rule (see DOMINIC, SAINT, AND THE DOMINICAN ORDER). Its innovation consisted in the appointment of the regular canons to the preacher's office, the confessional and pastoral charges. The constitution of the order developed similarly to that of the Cistercians, since, in like contrast with the older orders, it, too, attained an international character. At the head of the whole order stood the abbot of Prémontré, as abbot-general upon whom the Premonstratensian constitution conferred a strict monarchical power. There is nothing distinctive in the liturgical regulations of the Premonstratensians. Flesh food for those in health is strictly forbidden, fasts occur frequently, and the scourge is used for mortification of the flesh as well as for chastisement. Penitential exercises are to be observed daily. Sins are classified as venial, intermediate, grave, graver, gravest; being subject to varieties of penance according to the class in question. The lightest penalties are to recite certain prayers and supplications in the convent, the severest involve lifelong incarceration and expulsion from the order.

Organization and Character of the Order.

The order spread very rapidly. The bull of ratification, in 1126, enumerated eight foundations. Both prior to the Cistercian order and collaterally the Premonstratensians especially spread through eastern Germany, and to it the district on the right bank of the Elbe owes its Christianization. Significant were the creation of model colonies among the new Dutch and Saxon settlers and the training of the Wends in agriculture, from Magdeburg as a center. Not until the firm grasp of Henry the Lion and Albert the Bear held the heathen in check did Premonstrant settlements flourish on Slavic soil, east of the Elbe. The cathedral chapters at Brandenburg, Havelberg, and Ratzeburg were supplied with Premonstrants; and as time passed, the episcopal sees in these bishoprics became occupied almost continually by them. The order spread among all countries of Roman Catholic Christendom: Hungary, Denmark, England, Sweden, Norway, Livonia, Portugal, Spain, Italy; likewise in the Holy Land. A century after its founding there were no less than 1,000 foundations of canons, 500 abbeys of Premonstrant nuns, 300 provostships, and 100 priories in thirty precincts. Their chief services were the training of native populations to make their land productive, missionary labors, reformation of the clergy, and the promotion of preaching, learning, and schools. As with the monastic orders generally, so here ensue in time certain mitigations of the original rule of reforms, and the creation of new congregations. After Innocent IV had emphasized the prohibition of flesh food (1245), Nicholas IV (1288) allowed the Premonstratensians the same when on journeys, and Pius II. (1460) made further concessions, limiting the prohibition of meat to Friday and Saturday, Advent, and Lent. Most of the foundations utilized this latitude, and the order became divided between foundations of " the major or common observance," and those of " the small and strict observance." The vast extent of the order was first reduced by the Reformation, which deprived it of its numerous foundations in the northern countries of Europe. Sundry Austrian foundations were abrogated by Joseph II.; the French abbeys were suspended by the French Revolution; and the foundations in Bavaria and Würtemberg fell a sacrifice to secularization. Only a few establishments in Austria, Hungary, and Russian Poland are maintained on the older footing. Women were admitted within the order by Norbert. At the present time there are houses of Premonstratensian nuns in Austria, Russian Poland, Belgium, Holland, France, Spain, and Switzerland. The order embraces five districts, seventeen abbeys or canonries, and five priories, and also eight nunneries of the second and third orders, including 997 male and 258 female members; and it supplies, among other positions, 119 incorporated pastorates, five colleges, seven gymnasia, thirteen missions, and nine theological institutions. There are also tertiaries to whom Benedict XIV accorded rich privileges in 1752; the adherents of this rank are

Later Growth.

especially represented in England and North America. G. GRÜTZMACHER.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sources for the life of the founder are the two lives with additions produced in *MGH, Script.*, xii (1881), 663–706, and in part in *ASB*, June, i. 819–858, and *MPL*, clxx. 1253–1344, Germ. transl. by G. Hertel in *Geschichtsschreiber der deutschen Vorzeit*, Leipsic, 1881; Herimann's *Ex miraculis S. Mariæ Laudunensis*, in *MGH, Script.*, xii. 653–660; the *Vita Godefridi*, in the same, pp. 513–530; the *Gesta archiepiscoporum Magdeburgensium*, in *MGH, Script.*, xiv (1883), 412; and the *Fundatio monasterii Gratiæ Dei*, in *MGH, Script.*, xx (1888), 683–691. On the early lives consult R. Rosenmund, *Die ältesten Biographien des heiligen Norbert*, Berlin 1874. A rich literature is indicated in Potthast, *Wegweiser*, pp. 1494–1496, giving materials for an exhaustive study; cf. Wattenbach, *DGQ*, ii (1886), 233–236, ii (1894), 263–265. Consult further: A. Tenkhoff, *Der heilige Norbert*, Münster, 1865; W Bernhardi, in *ADB*, vol. xxiv.; idem, *Lothar von Supplinburg*, Leipsic, 1875; M. Geuden, *The Life of St. Norbert*, London, 1886; G. Madelaine, *Hist. de S. Norbert*, 2d ed., Lille, 1887.

On the order: The rules, etc., may be found in E. Martene, *De antiquis ecclesiæ ritibus*, iii. 229 sqq., Antwerp, 1764; L. Holstenius, *Codex regularum*, v. 162 sqq., Augsburg, 1759; M. Du Pré, *Annales breves ordinis Præmonstratensis*, ed., I. van Spilbeeck, Namur, 1886; J. de Paige, *Bibliotheca Præmonstratensis ordinis*, 2 vols., Paris, 1663. For accounts of the order consult: Heimbucher, *Orden und Kongregationen*, ii. 50–69, 83–85 (contains a fine selected list of literature); Helyot, *Ordres monastiques*, ii. 156 sqq.; Leuckfeld, *Antiquitates Præmonstratenses*, Magdeburg, 1721; F. Winter, *Die Præmonstratenser des 12. Jahrhunderts und ihre Bedeutung für das nordöstliche Deutschland*, Berlin, 1865; C. Taiée, *Prémontré*, 2 vols., Laon, 1872; I. Coldefy, *Études sur l'ordre sacré de Prémontré*, Perigueux, 1879; M. Geudens, *A Sketch of the Præmonstratensian Order in Great Britain and Ireland*, London, 1878; idem, *Natuur, Samenstelling end Zendig der Order van Præmonstreit*, Averbode, 1894; idem, *Annus asceticus Norbertinus sive monita spiritualia excerpta*, Buckley Hall, 1895; F. Danner, *Catalogus totius ordinis Præmonstratensis*, Innsbruck, 1894; F. A. Gasquet, *The English Præmonstratensians*, in *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, vol. xvii., London, 1903; J. von Walter, *Die ersten Wanderprediger Frankreichs*, ii. 119–129, Leipsic, 1906; Schaff, *Christian Church*, v. 1, pp. 360–361; *KL*, x. 267 sqq.

PRENTISS, ELIZABETH PAYSON: American author; b. at Portland, Me., Oct. 26, 1818; d. at Dorset, Vt., Aug. 13, 1878. While a young girl she began to write for *The Youth's Companion*. In 1845 she was married to George Lewis Prentiss (q.v.), then just ordained as a pastor in New Bedford, Mass. She published more than twenty volumes, among which were the *Little Susy Library* (New York, 1854); *The Flower of the Family* (1854); *Only a Dandelion and other Stories* (1854); *Fred, Maria, and Me* (1867); *The Little Preacher* (1867); *The Percys* (1870); *The Home at Greylock* (1876); *Pemaquid* (1877); *Avis Benson and Other Sketches* (1879); and her most famous work, *Stepping Heavenward* (1869): these works had an enormous sale in America. Many of them were republished in Great Britain, and had a wide circulation there. *The Flower of the Family*, *Stepping Heavenward*, and several others, were translated into French and German. The latter made the strongest impression; it is estimated that more than 100,000 copies have been sold in America. She was the author also of the hymn, "More love to thee, O Christ."

BIBLIOGRAPHY: G. L. Prentiss, *Life and Letters of Elizabeth Prentiss*, New York, 1882, new ed., 1886; S. W. Duffield, *English Hymns*, p. 358, ib. 1886; Julian, *Hymnology*, p. 908.

PRENTISS, GEORGE LEWIS: Presbyterian; b. at Gorham, Me., May 12, 1816; d. at New York Mar. 19, 1903. He graduated at Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Me., 1835; was assistant in Gorham Academy, 1836–37; studied theology at the universities of Halle and Berlin (1839–41); and became pastor of the South Trinitarian Church, New Bedford, Mass., 1845. In April, 1851, he was installed pastor of the Mercer Street Presbyterian Church, New York; resigned on account of ill-health in the spring of 1858, and sought rest in Europe for the next two years. On his return he organized the Church of the Covenant, New York, and was pastor, 1862–73; and professor of pastoral theology, church polity, and mission work, in Union Theological Seminary, New York, 1873–97. He published *A Memoir of Seargent S. Prentiss* (2 vols., New York, 1855; later ed., 1879); *The Life and Letters of Elizabeth Prentiss* (1882); *The Union Theological Seminary in the City of New York* (3 vols., New York, 1889–99); and *The Bright Side of Life* (autobiographic, 2 vols., 1901).

PRESBYTER, PRESBYTERATE.

I. In the Early Church.
Biblical Views (§ 1).
Origin of Church Organization (§ 2).
II. Presbyterial Government from the Reformation.
Lutheran and Zwinglian (§ 1).
Calvinistic (§ 2).
In Great Britain and the United States (§ 3).
The Reformed Churches (§ 4).
Modern Europe (§ 5).

I. In the Early Church: The researches of C. F. G. Heinrici, Edwin Hatch, and A. Harnack have referred the terms presbyter and bishop to distinct offices. The presbyters were the elder members of the congregation, of which they later formed a separate body acting essentially in judicial functions. The bishops, aided by the deacons, were the administrating heads of the community, especially in directing divine service and in financial affairs. With reference to the latter function the term was used also in non-Christian circles. Presbyters and bishops (with deacons) would thus represent a diversified organization, patriarchal and administrative respectively, the government of the congregation arising from the amalgamation of the two. In the course of time the bishops would be included in the body of presbyters, and finally the presiding officer of the presbytery would become the head of the entire community as the one bishop. This would seem to controvert the old Protestant thesis that bishops and presbyters were originally identical, but it was soon observed that many objections might be urged against the new hypothesis. Thus in Acts xx. 17, 28; Titus i. 5, 7; and I Clement xliv. 4–5 (Eng. transl., *ANF*, i. 17), the terms presbyter and bishop seem to be used indiscriminately. On the other hand the presbyters, and indeed (Didache xv. 1; Eng. transl., vii. 381) the bishops and deacons are described as conducting divine service (cf. I Tim. v. 17; II Clement xvii. 3–5; Hermas, *Vision*, II., iv. 2–3; Eng. transl., ii. 12). The strongest objection to the theory is that it presupposes a complicated system of administration

1. Biblical Views.

at a period characterized by a lack of clearly defined functions. The term presbyter, moreover, shows a variety of meanings. Primarily it denotes the older men in the community (I Tim. v. 1; I Clement i. 3, xxi. 6, Eng. transl., *ANF*, i. 5, 11); and then the chosen heads of the community (Acts xi. 30, xiv. 23, xv. 2, 4, 6, 22–23, xvi. 4, xx. 17, xxi. 18; I Clement xliv. 5, xlvii. 6, liv. 2, lvii. 1, Eng. transl., i. 17-19; II Clement xvii. 3, 5). To distinguish the presbyters from the elders such phrases as "the elders that rule well" (I Tim. v. 17; cf. I Clement liv. 2; Eng. transl., i. 19; Hermas, *Vision*, II., iv. 3; Eng. transl., ut sup.) were employed. Presbyter, in Christian as in pagan societies, was an official designation developing from the standing of the older members, but none the less denoting also spirit-filled men; and in Asia, at least, the presbyter was an apostolic personage (II John i. 1; III John 1; I Peter v. 1).

2. Origin of Church Organization.

The growth of the organization of the early Church may have been somewhat as follows: the churches were founded by itinerant apostles who believed themselves called of God to this highest honor (Gal. i. 1 sqq.). They left behind them, as a rule, certain trustworthy members of the community who were empowered to conduct the affairs of the churches (Acts vi. 5). There was, however, no definite method of procedure, for sometimes the apostles appointed the heads of the communities (Acts xiv. 23; Titus i. 5; I Clement xlii. 4, Eng. transl., *ANF*, i. 16), and sometimes they were chosen by the churches (Didache, xv. 1; I Clement xliv. 3; Eng. transl., *ANF*, vii. 381, i. 17), the latter procedure steadily increasing in frequency. There were, therefore, almost from the beginning, two principles of authority in the Church; the preachers of the Word called by the Spirit and the officials appointed by the congregation. A strict demarcation between the two classes seems to have arisen only gradually, though little by little the official type gained in importance. The latter represented the principles of order and tradition; they were the most noteworthy members of the community. Though they lacked a specific designation as late as 53 A.D. (I Thess. v. 12; cf. Acts vi. 1 sqq.), they later acquired the general appellation of presbyter. The elders of the community soon formed two groups, the ruling and the executing officials, called respectively bishops and deacons (Phil. i. 1). At the same time the term presbyter remained in use for the bishops alone and for the bishops and deacons together. Later bishops and presbyters were identified, and deacon became the title for the lowest grade of the officers of the community. The congregation was always admonished to show proper respect to the presbyters (I Thess. v. 12 sqq.; Heb. xiii. 7, 17, 24; Didache, iv. 1, xv. 2; Eng. transl., *ANF*, vii. 378, 382). At the same time, as the presbyters became more united, their antithesis to the prophets increased (cf. I Thess. v. 19 sqq.), over whom they ultimately triumphed. Simultaneously the names bishop and presbyter became titles of distinct officers. The board of executive officers were now called presbyters and were superior to the deacons, while at the head of the entire congregation was the bishop, a development which had been completed by the time of Ignatius. The number of presbyters was in proportion to the size of the community. There were forty-six in Rome in 251, and four in Cirta in 303. Originally they were chosen by the community, but later by the clergy. The duties of the presbyters consisted in preaching, baptizing, and reading the liturgy; they took part as a body in church discipline; and they had their seats in the synod. They thus possessed the same rights as the bishop with the exception of ordination, which was reserved for him alone. The close connection between bishop and presbyter was often emphasized; both were designated priests, and sat together at worship. Where a large congregation had several churches the presbyters officiated independently in one of them; but if a community had only one church the presbyters retired to the background. In later time the bishop was generally chosen from their number, the oldest or most efficient presbyter being selected, according to the principle that a clerical should pass through all the official stages. At an early period the presbyter, whose canonical age was gradually reduced from thirty-five to twenty-five, was forbidden to marry twice or to marry after ordination. This has remained the usage of the Eastern Church, while with the beginning of the fourth century absolute prohibition to marry appeared in the West. The right to engage in secular occupations was also forbidden only gradually. See Organization of the Early Church; Bishop; Clergy; Episcopacy; Polity; Presbyterians, X.

(H. Achelis.)

II. Presbyterial Government Since the Reformation: Neither the early Lutherans nor the Zwinglians knew of a presbyterian system of government, even the ideal scheme of the former containing no presbyterian elements. Nevertheless, Luther was not opposed to such a system of organization, for he occasionally advised pastors not to act on their own responsibility, but to consult suitable persons in their churches. These suitable persons were termed seniors or presbyters (cf. Melanchthon, *CR*, iii. 965; Johann Brenz's agenda of 1526; A. L. Richter, *Lehrbuch des Kirchenrechts*, i. 45; and the Hessian discipline of 1539, Richter, ut sup., i. 291). These ideas, however, meant little in practise since final authority in government rested in the hands of the consistories of the territorial rulers. When elders or "church fathers" are mentioned in somewhat later Lutheran agenda (the general visitation article of Elector-Saxony of 1557 or the agenda of Naumburg-Zeitz of 1545; and see Agenda) the term implies the treasurers, or trustees of the property interests. However, the instance, according to Matt. xviii. 16, of admonition in the presence of several persons or the investigation of the conduct of the pastor by the elders of the congregation obtained no permanent foothold. How little the like entered Luther's mind is shown by his rendering of the Biblical term, presbyter. While Brenz drew up a Scriptural order of church-government, at the center of which was the instructing bishop, surrounded by a board of presbyters, Luther

1. Lutheran and Zwinglian.

identified the two orders (according to Acts xx. 28; Titus i. 5, 7); though he availed himself of this identification only to assail the superior jurisdiction of the bishops. For the corresponding development of the Zwinglians, see CHURCH DISCIPLINE, IV., § 1.

The real presbyterial idea was worked out by John Calvin (q.v.). His earliest utterances show that he ascribed comprehensive powers to the Church as such, the Word of God standing in the center; not only to be preached but also to be made fruitful in the community by corresponding organization. More than this, he demanded special organs for excommunication, besides the preacher; and, without any doctrinaire principles, he could accordingly bring the Church more or less into union with the State. These ideas were carried through somewhat in Calvin's sense after 1541 (for fuller presentation, see CHURCH DISCIPLINE, IV., §§ 2–3). At the same time, the Church had a spiritual power of its own, and therefore needed "a certain peculiar spiritual polity, yet one quite distinct from the civil government, neither hindering nor diminishing it in any respect, but rather aiding and promoting it much" (*Institutes*, IV., xi. 1; cf. viii. 1, xx. 1). This ecclesiastical organization was not based by Calvin on the theory of general priesthood or on a right of the congregation to self-government, but simply on the need of discipline to prepare the way for the Word of God which, unlike civil justice, should influence the individual from within. For the execution of its penalties Christ had given his Church the proper officials through whom he himself reigned (IV., iii. 1, 4, 8). The apostles, prophets, and evangelists of Eph. iv. 11 being excluded as possessing extraordinary gifts, pastors and teachers remained as essential to the Church. Excepting offices, in like manner, peculiar to Apostolic times from Rom. xii. 7 and I Cor. xii. 28, two other functions remain; government and care of the poor. Calvin thus derived four offices, of which the teachers (chiefly professors of theology) are mentioned only in specifically Calvinistic ordinances. The pastors and elders are comprised in one category of presbyters, of whom there were two divisions, one for teaching and the other for discipline (IV., xi. 6). The system thus constituted did not perform its functions by virtue of legal installation as in Roman Catholicism, but by virtue of the presence of the living Christ in the Spirit (IV., ix. 1). The principles of Calvinistic Presbyterianism could logically be carried out only in churches in which the protection of the State could not become an alien predomination. On such a soil the need of independent organization was more urgently felt, and the rules of the Scriptures were more strongly emphasized. The lack of sympathy with democratic representation on the part of the Huguenot communities was shown by the unfavorable replies of several national synods to the proposition that the united community should have the right to vote. On the other hand, independency was sharply opposed, and it was insisted that no regulation of an individual congregation could conflict with the general articles of the Church, and that the installation and discipline of pastors and elders should be done by provincial synods.

2. Calvinistic.

The Calvinistic system was maintained most consistently in Scotland and the Puritan Presbyterianism which proceeded from that country. Even in questions of organization the Scriptures alone were taken as the basis, and the sole lord and king of the Church was Christ, in whose name all ecclesiastical authority should be exercised through the three offices of ministers, ruling elders, and deacons, whose functions were judicial rather than legislative. As among the French Reformed, the system of government comprised the session, presbytery, provincial synod, and general synod. The members of the presbytery were delegated by the sessions, and the members of the two higher bodies by the presbyteries, the pastors and laity generally being represented equally. The presiding officer of all these bodies is usually termed the "moderator," the desire being to avoid any title indicating permanent control, in view of the equality of all pastors and congregations. The moderator of the session is the pastor, and the presiding officer of the higher bodies may also be a ruling elder. The office of elders is held for life, and the old law of cooptation is found only sporadically, its place being taken by the election of representatives by the congregations. Early Presbyterian principles have been retained in the British and American churches more closely than anywhere else, and since 1875 their adherents have formed the Alliance of Reformed Churches holding the Presbyterian System (q.v.), whose general councils are held quadrennially. The entire group of Presbyterian churches maintains its position carefully against both episcopacy and independency, and holds that its system is divinely lawful, though not necessary to salvation.

3. In Great Britain and the United States.

The penetration of Calvinism into Holland from the south after 1555 gave the congregations unity and strength. The organization was influenced both by the French system and by Johannes à Lasco (q.v.), and the basal principles, which vary in different provinces, were established by the Wesel Conference (1568), the Synod of Bedburg (1570), the Synod of Emden (1571), and the national Synods of Dort (1578, 1618–19), Middelburg (1581), and The Hague (1586). The governing bodies are the session (kerkenraad), classis, and provincial and national synods; and the officers are "ministers of the Word of God," elders, and deacons (theologians generally being added). New elders are usually chosen by the session and the board of deacons, but with the peculiar feature that in Holland they are elected for terms of two years each, so that half their number are chosen annually. Along the Lower Rhine, on the other hand, the presbyteries are self-perpetuating bodies without reference to the deacons. In the German Reformed regions the ecclesiastical presbyterian elements blended with the civil consistorial factors. In the Palatinate the church council of the elector had long been the established form when presbyteries were introduced, which, however, failed to obtain a

4. The Reformed Churches.

permanent footing in many other districts of the Church. In all the German Reformed districts, as in the Lutheran, the supervision of the churches was essentially in the hands of the official consistories and superintendents.

With the break in the course of development in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, except in British and American Presbyterianism and in various smaller bodies, presbyterian government was introduced, though in a widely divergent form, in the great majority of Reformed, unionistic, and even Lutheran church-districts. In the new system of organization the disciplinary features of the early presbyteries retire to the background to make place for the principle of self-government of the congregations, especially in matters of property The model was no longer apostolic, but parliamentary. The first reorganization of this type was made in France in 1802, with the provision that the members of the "consistory" should be chosen from the most heavily taxed residents of the district. This requirement was discarded in 1852 when a "presbyterial council" was erected for each parish. The elders were elected for six years, and in Holland for four. The formation of the Swiss Confederation in 1874 gave the impulse for legislation on church organization in several cantons, the laws in question being colored by the current popular political views. Great importance is attached almost everywhere to the congregational assembly, to which only those members of the church belong who are qualified to vote in the State, religious qualifications nowhere being required. These assemblies have not only to choose the pastors (mostly for six years) and the members of the congregational council, but also exercise wide influence on local legislation and administration. The presiding officer of the council is usually the pastor, though in Bern (from 1874) and Zurich (from 1895) he may be elected to the council, to which he does not belong in virtue of his office. In 1900 Zurich enacted that a pastor not chosen a member should still have a voice and vote, but that no pastor should be the presiding officer. The duties are mostly administrative, though in a few cantons (Aargau, 1868, 1894; Thurgau, 1870) police regulations prevail whereby the ecclesiastical administration, empowered with extensive control of morals, may lay requirements on its members and invoke civil authority to enforce them. Over the church-council is the synod, whose members are directly elected (in Zurich one for each 2,000 Protestants). This, in its turn, is subject to the higher church-council; either a purely synodal product for the stated administration, or supplemented by deputies from the civil council of the canton. The small free Swiss churches of Vaud (1847), Geneva (1848), and Neuenburg (1874) have restored the Calvinistic offices, though the elders are elected by the congregations for terms of six years. In Germany the Rhenish-Westphalian agenda of 1835 (revised in 1853) marked the transition from the older Reformed system to the modern methods. A relic of the older conditions is the distinction between clergy and laity. The government is by a presbytery consisting of the pastor or pastors, elders, and "church masters" (such as treasurers or building-officials and deacons). The elders are chosen for four years, and are required to be upright in life and regular communicants. In contrast with the earlier system, all qualified members constitute the presbytery in churches of less than two hundred. Over the presbyteries are the district synods which elect their own presiding officers, the superintendent and assessor being confirmed by the supreme ecclesiastical council. The provincial synods consist of all the superintendents and of one clerical and one lay deputy from each of the district synods. The Austrian system of 1866 corresponds very closely with that of Rhenish-Westphalia, except that the congregation elects only representatives and these form the presbytery. The order of 1873 for the six eastern provinces of Prussia resembles also the Rhenish-Westphalian. The chief deviations are as follows: The patron of the church may be a member or may be represented in the presbytery, of which the first clergyman is the presiding officer. Any one may be elected elder except those notoriously indifferent to religion. The pastor is explicitly declared to be independent of the presbytery in his official functions, and in cases of ecclesiastical discipline may appeal to the district synod. The superintendents, being civil officers, are not elected. Members of the provincial synod, not exceeding a sixth of the representatives to be elected by the district synods, are also appointed by the ruler; likewise for the general synod of the eight older provinces. In several states the older Prussian system prevails, while the Rhenish-Westphalian principle of enlarged representation has not been followed, although the modern presbyterial form prevails, in the churches of Brunswick (since 1851), Oldenburg (1853), Waldeck (1857), Hanover (1864), Saxony (1878), Hamburg (1883), Schaumburg-Lippe (1893), the united church of the Bavarian Rhine palatinate (1876), the reformed church of Lippe-Detmold (1876), and the Thuringian churches. In the last-named (e.g., Meiningen since 1876; Saxon grand duchy, 1895) the teachers are included in the governing body, while in Schwarzburg the control of church and school is vested in a single body. The earlier double representation still exists in the Lutheran Church of part of Bavaria. The qualifications which fit one to become a candidate for the office of elder are in the newer stipulations prevailingly negative, but are formulated with exceedingly great care; the Lutheran Church of the kingdom of Saxony changed in 1896 the earlier negative statement of 1868 into positive form: "Only those are eligible who are legal members of the organization in good standing, of tried Christian integrity, and possessed of ecclesiastical insight and experience." (E. F. KARL MÜLLER.)

5. Modern Europe.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The literature is fully given under ORGANIZATION OF THE EARLY CHURCH; POLITY, ECCLESIASTICAL; and PRESBYTERIANS. Of especial value are the works of Bingham, Augusti, Hatch, and Harnack. The major works on church history (Neander, Schaff, Kurtz, etc.) are of course to be consulted, and especially those on the Apostolic Age by Weizsäcker and McGiffert.

PRESBYTERIAN ALLIANCE. See ALLIANCE OF THE REFORMED CHURCHES.

PRESBYTERIANS.

I. Scotland.
1. The Church of Scotland.
Early Christianity in Scotland (§ 1).
The Reformation (§ 2).
Presbytery Dominant (§ 3).
Lay Patronage and the "Disruption" (§ 4).
Worthies of the Church (§ 5).
Statistics, Constitution, and Government (§ 6).
Agencies of the Church (§ 7).
Social and Colonial Work (§ 8).
Missionary and Other Agencies (§ 9).
2. United Free Church.
Early Constitution and Ideals (§ 1).
Early Secessions (§ 2).
The United Presbyterian Church (§ 3).
Free Church; Origin (§ 4).
Free Church; Development; Theological Controversies (§ 5).
Movements Toward Union (§ 6).
Union of 1900 (§ 7).
Free Church Minority; Legal Proceedings; Settlement (§ 8).
Results; Present Position (§ 9).
Statistics and Missions (§ 10).
Doctrine and Constitution (§ 11).
3. The Free Church of Scotland.
4. Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland.
5. Reformed Presbyterian Church.
6. United Original Secession Church.
Origin (§ 1).
Unions; Statistics (§ 2).
II. Presbyterian Church of England.
Presbyterian Principles Informally Established (§ 1).
Royal and Parliamentary Opposition (§ 2).
Infusion of Scotch Elements (§ 3).
The Present Church in England (§ 4).
III. Ireland.
1. Presbyterian Church in Ireland.
2. Reformed Presbyterian or Covenanting Church of Ireland.
3. Secession Church in Ireland.
IV. Welsh Calvinistic Methodist Connection.
Origin (§ 1).
Contributory Movements (§ 2).
Organization, Activities, and Statistics (§ 3).
V. South, Central, and West Africa.
VI. Australia.
1. New South Wales.
2. Queensland.
3. Victoria (formerly Australia Felix).
4. South Australia.
5. Western Australia.
6. Tasmania.
VII. New Zealand.
Beginnings of Presbyterianism (§ 1).
Era of Settlements (§ 2).
Union of the Presbyteries (§ 3).
Missions and Statistics (§ 4).
VIII. In the United States and Canada.
1. Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.
Sources and Varieties of American Presbyterianism (§ 1).
Period of Isolated Churches (§ 2).
Colonial Presbyterian Church (§ 3).
Constitution of 1788 (§ 4).
Period of the Plan of Union (§ 5).
Period of Division (§ 6).
Period of Reunion (§ 7).
Standards (§ 8).
Church Agencies (§ 9).
2. Presbyterian Church in the United States.
Background and Origin (§ 1).
Period of the War and Accretions (§ 2).
Evangelization; Home and Foreign Missions (§ 3).
Other Agencies; Prospects (§ 4).
3a. Cumberland Presbyterian Church Before the Union of 1906.
Origin (§ 1).
Theology and Principles (§ 2).
Educational Institutions and Missions (§ 3).
The Union of 1906 (§ 4).
3b. Cumberland Presbyterian Church Since the Union of 1906.
4. Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America.
5. Associate Reformed Synod of the South.
6. United Presbyterian Church of North America.
Origins in Scotland and America (§ 1).
Formation, Work, and Statistics (§ 2).
Its Agencies (§ 3).
7. Reformed Presbyterian Church in North America (General Synod).
8. Calvinistic Methodist Church (Welsh Presbyterian Church in America).
Founding of Churches (§ 1).
Organization of Presbyteries, Synods, and General Assembly (§ 2).
Doctrine, Polity, and Worship (§ 3).
9. Cumberland Presbyterian Church, Colored.
10. Reformed Presbyterian Church (Covenanted).
11. Reformed Presbyterian Church in the United States and Canada.
12. Presbyterian Church in Canada.
Origins (§ 1).
Under British Rule (§ 2).
Period of Unions (§ 3).
Church Agencies (§ 4).
IX. In Other Lands.
X. Presbyterian Church Polity.
1. Doctrine.
2. Polity.
Scriptural Basis (§ 1).
Government (§ 2).
3. Worship.

I. Scotland.—1. The Church of Scotland: The first Christian church in Scotland is traditionally said to have been built at Whithorn, Galloway, about 402. The builder was St. Ninian (q.v.), whose influence did not long survive his death in 432, and the country relapsed into heathenism. The continuous history of Christianity in Scotland begins with the landing of St. Columba (q.v.) and his companions at Iona (q.v.) in 563 (see CELTIC CHURCH, I., § 3). It was centuries after his death that the buildings which still stand on the island were erected, but it was the memory of Columba which made Dr. Johnson say that the man was little to be envied whose piety would not grow warmer among the ruins of Iona. The government of the Columban Church was in some sense a combination of presbytery and episcopacy; though there were bishops among the missionaries, all were subject to the rule of the Presbyter Columba. The great contemporary of Columba was St. Kentigern (q.v.), whose memory is preserved in the beautiful cathedral of Glasgow. The government of the Columban Church was destined to be superseded. For the change from the Irish system to the Roman see CELTIC CHURCH IN BRITAIN AND IRELAND, II.–III. It was not till 716 that the monks of Iona altogether abandoned their traditional practises. It is unfortunate that the period of the Culdees is wrapt in such obscurity; for all evidence seems to indicate that it was a period of exceptional righteousness and godliness. The last lingering traces of distinctively Celtic modes of belief and worship disappeared in the reign of Queen Margaret, who was a devotee of Rome. In succeeding centuries, considerable irritation was caused by the attempts of English prelates to establish supremacy over the Church of Scotland. And, occasionally, Scotland was excommunicated by the pope. By degrees the need of a reformation began to be proclaimed, and a long and deadly struggle ensued. The efforts to put down by force the growing spirit of inquiry and the return to a more primitive Christianity were utterly ineffectual. "The reek of Maister Patrick Hamilton" (q.v.), protomartyr of the Scottish Reforma-

1. Early Christianity in Scotland.

2. The Reformation.

tion, "infected as many as it blew upon." The martyrdom of George Wishart (q.v.) was terribly avenged by the murder of Cardinal Beaton (q.v.). The assassination caused a certain reaction in favor of Rome, for the cardinal had been an ardent patriot. The Romanist party sought help from France, and the Protestants sought help from England. The assassins of the cardinal and many who had no sympathy with the assassination were driven to take refuge in the castle of St. Andrews, which, after a protracted siege, surrendered to the attacks of the Royal army and of a French fleet. The defenders were carried to France, among them being John Knox (q.v.), who for nineteen months toiled as a galley slave. After his release, on the intercession of King Edward VI., Knox became one of the king's chaplains and took part in the preparation of the English Prayer Book of 1552. The accession of Queen Mary to the throne of Scotland drove him to the continent where, amid other vicissitudes, he ministered at Geneva and at Frankfort. During his absence the Reformation continued to make progress, but his return to Scotland in 1559 gave new life to the movement and insured its triumph. The year 1560 witnessed the consolidation, national recognition, and establishment of the Reformed Church. The first general assembly was held and the *Scotch Confession of Faith* (q.v.) and the *First Book of Discipline* were issued. The government of the church was vested in superintendents, ministers, doctors, elders, and deacons. The Lord's Supper was to be celebrated four times a year. In towns there was to be daily service. Marriages were to be performed "in open face and public audience of the Kirk." *The Book of Common Order*, often called "John Knox's Liturgy," originally prepared by the English congregation at Geneva and for its own use, was recommended in 1564 and was generally, though not exclusively, used in public worship for eighty years. The Reformation in Scotland took a form different from that of the Reformation in England, partly because in England the monarch and the bishops were in favor of the Reformation, while in Scotland they were against it. It was by presbyters that the change was effected, and the government of the church naturally became Presbyterian. The Reformers did not look upon themselves as setting up a "new church." Their aim was to purify the temple, to strengthen it by clearing away excrescences and corruptions. Much attention was paid by the Reformers to education, and a system was introduced which, though altered toward the close of last century, must ever be remembered with gratitude.

The organization of the reformed church as it now exists in Scotland was not achieved without a weary and protracted conflict. Sometimes presbytery, sometimes episcopacy, in different forms, occupied the field; sometimes they existed together. The National Covenant, signed in Greyfriars Churchyard, Edinburgh, in 1638, and the Solemn League and Covenant, signed at St. Margaret's, Westminster, in 1643, left a deep impress on the national life (see COVENANTERS, §§ 3–4); and the names of those who, either on the field of battle or by execution, sealed their convictions with their blood, are, especially in the southern counties of Scotland, held to this hour in peculiar veneration and affection. The general assembly of 1638, which met in the cathedral of Glasgow, deposed or suspended all the bishops. The Westminster Assembly (q.v.) issued the *Confession of Faith* (see WESTMINSTER STANDARDS), which for ten years was accepted from John o' Groats to Land's End, and still remains the official standard of the Scottish church and of the churches which have sprung from her. The strife was practically ended by the revolution of 1688, when presbytery was finally ratified, though the Covenants were set aside. The king's message, which was read to the general assembly of 1690, contained the significant counsel "We expect that your management shall be such as we shall have no reason to repent of what we have done. We never could be of the mind that violence was suited to the advancing of true religion, nor do we intend that our authority shall ever be a tool to the irregular passions of any party. Moderation is what religion requires, neighboring Churches expect from, and we recommend to, you." It is in accordance with this counsel that the Church of Scotland has, with occasional unhappy exceptions, endeavored to act.

3. Presbytery Dominant.

A source of trouble was in 1712 introduced by the revival of lay patronage. This was the main cause of the formation of the Associate Presbytery in 1733, its chief leader being Ebenezer Erskine (q.v.), and of the Relief Synod in 1752, its chief leader being Thomas Gillespie (q.v.). This cause had also much to do with the division of the church into the two great parties of Moderates and Evangelicals. Among the leaders of the Moderates were Principal William Robertson the historian, Principal George Campbell (q.v.), Hugh Blair (q.v.), and Principal George Hill, whose *Lectures in Divinity* (3 vols., Edinburgh, 1821, 5th ed., 1850) formed for several generations the accepted code of sound doctrine. Among the leaders of the Evangelicals were John Erksine (q.v.), Sir Henry Moncreiff-Wellwood of St. Cuthbert's, Andrew Thomson (q.v.) of St. George's, Edinburgh; and, greatest of all, Thomas Chalmers (q.v.). By some strange misunderstanding, Moderates and Evangelicals concurred in the deposition of John McLeod Campbell (q.v.) for teaching the doctrine of "universal atonement and pardon through the death of Christ"; and of Edward Irving (q.v.) for teaching the "sinfulness of Christ's human nature." But concurring in doctrinal matters, the Moderates and Evangelicals became in ecclesiastical matters more irreconcilable. The occasional forcing into parishes of nominees of patrons against the declared wish and vehement protests of the parishioners embittered the controversy and hastened on the "disruption." A "Ten Years' Conflict" ended in May, 1843, by the withdrawal of 451 ministers who, under the moderatorship of Dr. Chalmers, constituted the Free Church of Scotland (see below, 3).

4. Lay Patronage and the "Disruption."

On those who remained was imposed the task of supplying the places left vacant, and when the

immediate effect of the stunning blow had passed, they set themselves to meet the new conditions.

A few typical examples of the many clergymen to whom the revival of the church is largely due may be cited. A notable influence in the work of restoration was James Robertson (q.v., 1), founder of the "Endowment Scheme" (see below), a man of fervid piety and pure disinterestedness, of wisdom and of tolerance. The introduction of instrumental music into public worship, and the desire to make the house of God more esthetically worthy of its sacred purpose, were in great measure owing to the efforts of Dr. Robert Lee, minister of Old Greyfriars, and professor of Biblical criticism in the University of Edinburgh. An extraordinary personal influence was wielded by Norman Macleod (q.v.), whose width of sympathy, untiring efforts on behalf of working people, consuming zeal for foreign missions, and eloquence in pulpit or on platform, won for him the admiration and affection of all classes of society. John Tulloch (q.v.) was a man of kindred spirit, "large of heart, full of sympathy, friendly with the lowest and the highest," devout but open-minded, tenaciously holding the catholic faith as embodied in the Nicene Creed but contending for a liberal interpretation of the Westminster formularies. In some respects John Caird (q.v.) was the greatest orator who ever adorned the Scottish pulpit. In the combination of profound thought with impassioned earnestness and dramatic force he stood unrivalled. The writings of William Milligan (q.v.) were highly appreciated in Scotland and even more cordially received in England. The same might be said of Andrew Kennedy Hutchison Boyd (q.v.). A preacher, poet, and religious genius who occupied a unique position was George Matheson (q.v.), who with marvellous cheerfulness and unflagging perseverance achieved, despite his blindness, a work surpassed by few. The life and labors of Dr. John Macleod in the large parish of Govan, and the eloquence and earnestness with which he enforced certain neglected aspects of the church, made a deep impression on many even of those to whom his views were not wholly acceptable. Probably no man in modern times has left a more indelible mark on the practical life of the church than Archibald Hamilton Charteris (q.v.) to whom was due the inception of the Christian Life and Work Committee with its manifold developments. Robert Herbert Story (q.v.) was a man of great force and loftiness of character, and singular tenderness of heart, a matchless debater, and the fearless and untiring champion of the church of his fathers.

5. Worthies of the Church.

The church reports 1,433 parish churches, 80 non-parochial churches, 170 mission charges, 702,075 communicants, 2,223 Sunday-schools, 20,887 teachers, 235,974 scholars, and total benevolences for home work £520,997 (an increase in thirty-four years of over £242,000). The sums contributed for church purposes since 1872 have amounted to between fifteen and sixteen millions sterling. Patronage was abolished in 1874, and the election of ministers is vested in communicants and adherents. The system of church courts is very efficient. There is in every parish a kirk session, consisting of the minister as moderator or president, and of "elders," the number of whom varies according to circumstances. The whole country is mapped out into eighty-four presbyteries, varying in extent and in the number of parishes included. The members of a presbytery consist of the minister of each parish, along with an elder; certain theological professors have also a right to sit in the court. The moderators of the presbyteries are at present almost universally appointed by rotation and their term of office is, as a rule, half a year. There are sixteen synods, the moderators of which are elected sometimes by a committee, sometimes by the votes of the synod. The supreme court is the general assembly, which consists of representatives, lay as well as clerical, from the presbyteries, universities, and royal burghs. It meets yearly in Edinburgh in May, and the opening is one of the picturesque events of the year, being in some respects unique among ecclesiastical gatherings. The king is represented by a nobleman, the lord high commissioner, who takes up his abode at the palace of Holyrood. After a levee at the palace, the commissioner goes in procession to St. Giles Cathedral, where divine service is conducted, the sermon being preached by the retiring moderator. After service, there is a procession to the General Assembly Hall where the court is constituted and the new moderator is installed. The lord high commissioner occupies a seat called the throne, but he has no voice in the discussions. There is an interchange of courtesies between him and the assembly. He conveys the good wishes of the king to the church and receives from the moderator the assurance of the loyalty of the church to the king. The duties of the moderator, who is chosen by the assembly, are to preside at the assembly and to take part in all sorts of meetings all over the country. The general assembly, as the supreme court, revises the proceedings of the synods, and finally disposes of such cases and questions as have arisen elsewhere. But, by the provision of the "Barrier Act," no new legislation is binding upon the whole church until it has received the sanction of the majority of the presbyteries.

6. Statistics, Constitution, and Government.

The practical work of the church is carried on by committees, of which a few may be mentioned. The Home Mission had its origin in the church-extension labors of Dr. Chalmers. The growth of the population had far outstripped the church accommodation provided for them. Appeals to the government for means to build new churches failed, and Chalmers determined that the work should be done by voluntary effort, and by the extension of the parochial or territorial system. To advance this project of church extension, Chalmers labored with extraordinary assiduity and success; and when he retired from the management it was united with some other minor schemes and became known as the Home Mission, which is now doing a vast amount of good work. It supplies in fluctuating populations, in remote districts, and in overcrowded lanes

7. Agencies of the Church.

services in school-rooms, in public halls, and in dwelling-houses, helps to support unendowed churches in poor localities, gives grants for building new churches or for enlarging those which have become too small for the congregations, appoints lecturers on pastoral theology in the four universities of Scotland, and provides chaplains for hospitals and for lodging-houses. The Women's Association for Home Missions, inaugurated in 1893, has, especially by means of parish sisters, proved a valuable auxiliary. The Home Mission finds its continuation and completion in the Endowment Scheme. Dr. James Robertson (q.v.) had taken the deepest interest in Dr. Chalmers's efforts for church extension, but wished to carry the matter a step farther. He resolved that the churches which had been built by voluntary effort should also by voluntary effort be endowed; and in 1846 he was appointed convener of a committee which had that end in view. In 1860, he was able to report to the general assembly that £400,000 had been subscribed, that sixty new parishes, technically known as *quoad sacra* parishes, had been erected. By the end of 1908, new parishes added to the church by the instrumentality of the Endowment Scheme numbered 452. "The total amount subscribed to secure the endowment alone of these parishes is about £1,673,330, apart from the cost of the fabrics. The population of these new parishes, as ascertained at the census of 1901, amounts to 2,150,000, the number of communicants on the roll being over 250,000." The Christian Life and Work Committee, appointed by the general assembly of 1869, was originated by Dr. Charteris. Its object as originally defined was "to inquire as to the progress of Christian work in this country and to consider and report as to the best means of promoting evangelistic efforts." The work of the committee is now divided into three main sections, evangelistic enterprise, development of Christian work, publications. Evangelistic enterprise includes mission weeks and conferences, deputations to fisher-folks in Orkney, Shetland, the Hebrides, also to those who go in the season to Lowestoft and Yarmouth; and deputations to rural parishes. The development of Christian work includes an institute of missionary training, where women are qualified to serve the church as deaconesses, parish sisters, missionaries, or missionary nurses, and men are qualified to serve as evangelists or home missionaries. The Woman's Guild, which now counts more than 700 branches, with a membership of 50,000, has had a successful career in fostering every kind of religious and philanthropic effort. The order of deaconesses was revived in 1889, and there are now fifty-one at work, their fields being singularly varied. The Deaconess Hospital in Edinburgh and the orphanage at Musselburgh have been widely beneficial. The Young Men's Guild, numbering 640 branches and 29,000 members, has been the means of enrolling many young lives in the service of the church. An outcome of the Woman's Guild and the Young Men's Guild may be seen in the *Guild Text-Books* and *Guild Library*, works prepared primarily for the use of members, though in circulation extending far beyond that circle.

8. Social and Colonial Work.

The Church of Scotland has, of late years, taken a special interest in social work, and nowhere has there been more noticeable progress. The assembly of 1903 appointed a committee to consider "whether the institution of central agencies such as an inebriate home, labor colony, and rescue home for women would support and develop the social work of the church in the parishes." The committee reported that the institution of such agencies ought to be adopted and furthered. The development has been exceedingly rapid. In Edinburgh, Glasgow, Dundee, Peebles, Ayr, and Perth there are now labor homes in which are received men who, either from misfortune or from fault, have fallen upon evil days and are anxious to retrieve themselves, and suitable ex-prisoners are also received into some of the homes. There are also homes for boys in Glasgow and Aberdeen, where employment is found for them in various trades, and at Humbie, Upper Keith, where they are prepared for farm work or for emigration. At Cornton Vale, near Stirling, there is a market-garden colony at which men are "employed at garden work and trained for a country life at home or in the colonies." Much is done for the protection or reclamation of women by means of homes both in town and country. In the police courts of both Edinburgh and Glasgow, cases are not infrequently handed over to the care of accredited agents of the committee, thereby not only preventing the stigma of conviction, but opening up the way to a better life. The Colonial Committee, formed in 1836, seeks to minister to the spiritual necessities of parts of the colonies where as yet congregations can not be self-supporting. Help is sent to many new settlements in Canada, Australia, and South Africa. By the aid of this committee Scottish services are maintained at various stations in India, Ceylon, Egypt, the West Indies, and East Africa. A sub-committee provides permanent chaplaincies at Paris, Dresden, Venice, Brussels, and summer chaplaincies at Geneva and Homburg. Another sub-committee is occupied with the spiritual oversight of Presbyterians in the army and navy; and the statement is justified that "no committee of the church, with an income which has never exceeded £600 a year, has ever accomplished a larger amount of good work."

9. Missionary and Other Agencies.

For the support of foreign missions the increase in contributions during the last thirty years has been astonishing. The average number of baptisms is about a thousand a year. There are 160 European missionaries and 700 native missionaries, including ministers, evangelists, and teachers. In Calcutta the work of the Church of Scotland and of the United Free Church has been amalgamated since 1908 and is carried on with renewed activity. The missions at Madras, Arkonam, and Poona, and in the Punjab, have an honorable record of devotion and faithful service. In the Eastern Himalayas there are three missions, in which at the close of 1907 there were more than 4,500 baptized native Christians. In Africa the Nyasaland Mission, including Blantyre, Domasi, Zomba, Mlanje, and the British East Africa mission

in the Kikuyu highlands have effected such results as to call forth enthusiastic approval. The "martyrs of Blantyre" have earned a place for themselves in missionary annals. The late Dr. Ruffelle-Scott ranks among the greatest of those who have carried the light of Christ to the dark places of the earth, a man most mystical yet most practical, a constant student yet sympathetic with the ignorant, inspired with burning zeal yet gifted with marvellous administrative skill. The Chinese mission at Ichang has now 852 baptized Christians, of whom 480 are communicants. Special commendation must be given to the work of the Women's Association for Foreign Missions, whose spheres of labor are virtually identical with those of the Foreign Missions Committee. "The staff abroad includes 62 European missionaries, four from New South Wales, and three from New Zealand. With the assistance of over 200 Eurasian and native teachers and Bible-women they carry on educational, evangelistic, industrial, and medical work in schools, zenanas, hospitals, and city and village dispensaries for women and children." Other committees are those on Education, the Conversion of the Jews, Small Livings, Aged and Infirm Ministers, Church Interests, Temperance, Sunday-schools, Highlands and Islands, Correspondence with other Reformed Churches, Psalmody and Hymns, Aids to Devotion, Benefice Registers, and Church Records. All of them, it may honestly be said, are under wise and capable management. The relation of the Church to the Westminster Confession has been receiving much attention in recent years; and the General Assembly of 1910, in the exercise of a right ratified by a recent Act of Parliament, has adopted a formula of subscription less rigid than that hitherto enjoined upon the clergy. In 1910 meetings were held between representatives of the Church of Scotland and of the United Free Church looking to the union of those bodies. PEARSON M'ADAM MUIR.

2. United Free Church: If the essence of the United Free Church be the soul in it that is marching on, it was born at the Reformation. The ideal of a Scottish National Church which then arose was of a church free from the State, self-constituted and self-governing. Scotland has always been by a vast majority Presbyterian, and her disputes have seldom been doctrinal. Divisions have been caused mainly by differences in the interpretation of the claim of the church to spiritual freedom, and by questions, often more theoretical than practical, regarding the relation of Church to State. The history of the religious forces now gathered up in the United Free Church is the history of successive stands made by men for their own ideal of a free church, and of the gradual aggregation of the various independent churches thus formed. Time and again the starting-point was, not dissent from a theological doctrine, but a differing interpretation of the application of the principle of spiritual independence, and a new assertion of the rights of the church. The United Free Church claims continuity through all its branches with the original reformed Church in Scotland, and maintains, as against decisions of the law courts, (particularly in the period preceding the Disruption of 1843 and in 1904), its own interpretation of the rights and powers of that church. In 1560 the church constituted itself and adopted Knox's Confession. It existed without sanction of any Act of Parliament until 1567. In 1647, without consulting Parliament, it displaced Knox's by the Westminster Confession. These and other acts are claimed as instances of the exercise of that spiritual freedom, between which and the advantages of the Establishment as interpreted by civil courts various parties considered in later times that they had to make their choice. This legislative power of altering doctrine, discipline, and government was, it was claimed by the United Free Church in the litigation following the union of 1900, recognized in the Barrier Act of 1697, which provided that no alteration should be made without being sent down to Presbyteries.

1. Early Constitution and Ideals.

The first formal division arose in 1688. Intransigeant **Cameronians** (see CAMERON, RICHARD, CAMERONIANS), in dissatisfaction with its compromising spirit, refused to concur in the Revolution Settlement and remained an isolated body until 1876 when they joined the Free Church. Next came the two secessions which eventually coalesced in the United Presbyterian Church. The first, the **Associate Synod,** originated through the deposition in 1733 of Ebenezer Erskine (q.v.), along with three supporters, for preaching a sermon claiming for Christ the headship of the Church and declaring the church "the freest society in the world." This was aimed especially at an Act of Assembly (1732) placing the election of ministers in the hands not of the congregation, but of the majority of elders and heritors. These four declined reinstatement a year later, disliking the hostility of the "Moderate" majority to their "Marrow" theology (see MARROW CONTROVERSY). They had forty-five congregations in 1747 when the great "Breach" took place on the question of the lawfulness of taking a certain burgess oath (see ERSKINE, EBENEZER). The breach was healed in 1820 when the **United Secession Church** was formed, but not before both **Anti-Burghers** and **Burghers** had thrown off small minorities of **Old Lights,** the main bodies or **New Lights** having developed more modern views as to the limitations of the duty of the civil magistrate in the ecclesiastical sphere (see below, 6, § 1). The "Old Light Burghers" found their way back to the Establishment just in time to come out at the Disruption. The "Old Light Antiburghers" (afterwards called **Original Seceders**) joined the Free Church in 1852, with the exception of a minute remnant who still remain separate. The United Secession Church was distinguished for its foreign missionary enthusiasm, and grew and prospered until the Union of 1847.

2. Early Secessions.

The second secession, going later to form the United Presbyterian Church, was the **Relief Church,** and originated with Thomas Gillespie (q.v.), who stood almost alone till 1761 when a presbytery was formed "for the relief of Christians oppressed in their Christian privileges." This church rapidly grew and was distinguished for its liberal spirit.

Unlike the Secession it invited all Christians to its ordinances, and in 1794 it sanctioned a hymn-book. The Union of the Secession and Relief Churches was accomplished in 1847, when the United Secession contributed about 400 congregations and the Relief 114 to the resulting **United Presbyterian Church** (for the documentary *Basis of Union* see below). To this last-named church and to its spiritual ancestors must be largely ascribed the fact that the cause of evangelical religion was maintained in Scotland. The career of the United Presbyterian Church was eminently prosperous. Always democratic, and possibly containing tendencies toward Congregationalism, it showed a vigorous and progressive activity. Missions have always been enthusiastically supported and in populous districts at home new congregations were planted. In ecclesiastical matters it was conspicuous for the clear and consistent assertion of the principle of "voluntaryism," *i.e.*, "the obligation of members to support and extend by voluntary contribution the ordinances of the Gospel," and it frequently passed resolutions calling for the disestablishment of the State Church. It was the first Presbyterian body to modify in a liberal and evangelical direction the terms of subscription to the Westminster Confession, which was done in the Declaratory Act of 1879. For the assistance of poorer congregations an Augmentation Fund was contributed by those able to do more than support their own minister, and this was divided among those unable to reach a minimum standard of stipend with a view to a uniform minimum for ministers of all congregations contributing at a certain rate per member to ministeral support. The church maintained a theological hall in Edinburgh, in connection with which the name of Principal John Cairns (q.v.) is famous. The organization of the church had this peculiarity that there were no provincial synods. The whole of the presbyteries met annually as one synod which was thus the supreme court of the church corresponding to the general assemblies of the others. At the Union of 1900 the United Presbyterian Church had 599 congregations, 199,089 members, and an average income of £403,736.

3. United Presbyterian Church.

Latest in origin, but largest and most influential, came the **Free Church** in 1843. Unlike previous secessions which began with days of small things the Free Church sprang into being on a national scale, and men spoke not of another secession but of the "Disruption" of the Established Church. Those who "came out" claimed to be the true Church of Scotland, and at once set about making its whole organization independent of the State. In every parish congregations were divided and over large areas of the Highlands all but a fractional remnant left the Establishment. The contention of the Free Church party was that the spiritual liberties of the church were being challenged by the State, and that the whole principle of spiritual independence was involved, although the immediate issue was the exercise of patronage. An act of parliament restoring patronage had been passed in 1712 in violation of the "Treaty of Union," and had been acquiesced in during the era of moderatism in the church. As the evangelical party grew in strength in the first part of the nineteenth century, its members began to resent the intrusion by indifferent patrons of "moderate" and often incompetent ministers upon unwilling congregations. But instead of agitating for the repeal of the act the assembly asserted powers of regulating the filling of vacant charges by the Veto Act of 1834, and of altering the constitution of church courts by admitting to them ministers of new extension (*quoad sacra*) parishes (i.e., ecclesiastical parishes defined by the Assembly, not old historic parishes recognized by law; see above, 1, § 7). These exercises of power were declared illegal by the court of session, which proceeded to give orders to presbyteries to ignore the Veto Act and to ordain certain presentees and not ordain certain others and to reject the votes of ministers of the new parishes. The issue thus became in the eyes of the Free Church party not the special grievance of patronage but the whole question of the rights of the church to maintain its own jurisdiction within the sphere claimed as ecclesiastical. This was the ground of the "Ten Years' Conflict" (1833-1843). Government refused to move. There was disbelief in the serious intentions of the evangelical party up to the last, even though they were making every preparation for the final step. This was taken at the opening meeting of the Assembly of 1843, and forms one of the most dramatic episodes in church history. Instead of constituting the Assembly the moderator read the "Protest" and "Claim of Right," laid them on the table and withdrew, followed by the entire evangelical party; the march in procession to Tanfield Hall was watched by cheering crowds, and there the first Free Church assembly was constituted with Thomas Chalmers as moderator, by whose side were Robert Smith Candlish, Thomas Guthrie (qq.v.), and the lawyer Alexander Murray Dunlop. Out of some 1,200 ministers, 474 joined the Free Church, together with every foreign missionary. The Free Church undertook the whole burden of the foreign missionary enterprise, sustained in every direction by the enthusiasm and generosity of the people. A central Sustentation Fund out of which each minister drew an equal dividend solved the problem of ministerial support. New College, Edinburgh, was founded for the training of the ministry, and the colleges at Glasgow and Aberdeen were founded a few years later. The work of building churches and manses rapidly proceeded in spite of obstacles presented in country districts. Elementary education had been in the hands of the church, and this responsibility, too, was faced by the Free Church. The Free Church schools were, along with those of the Established Church, merged in a national system in 1872, and the training-colleges for teachers were also handed over in 1907, subject to certain provisions for religious instruction.

4. Free Church: Origin.

The later history of the Free Church down to the union of 1900 is one of growth and advance. Within a few years of the Disruption the Home Mission problem of the city slums was attacked and many

new churches were organized in poorer districts. Later on the movement of population made necessary the systematic planting of new churches in growing suburban districts. In 1869 and 1874 the department of Home Missions received a great impetus from the revival movements following the visits of Dwight Lyman Moody (q.v.). The growth of foreign missions may be read in the list of missions brought by the Free Church into the Union. Assistance was also given to colonial churches, and preaching-stations were maintained at some continental resorts. The last twenty years before the Union saw several controversies in the Free Church over the attitude of the church toward the new historical methods of Bible study, especially as seen in the writings of its own professors. Scholarship of the highest order had found a home in its colleges. The more studious students and ministers went to Germany or read German books, and dark rumors went abroad of what was taught there. Then came the bold proclamation of the Gospel from a Darwinian platform by Henry Drummond (q.v.). Conservative minds were offended and scared, in spite of the fact that those they attacked were among the most zealous and evangelical teachers the church possessed. The first storm arose over the articles of William Robertson Smith (q.v.; then professor of Hebrew in Aberdeen College, afterward of Arabic in Cambridge) in the new *Encyclopædia Britannica*. After fierce debates it was made clear that since the Westminster Confession furnished no dicta on such subjects as the date and authorship of the Pentateuch, and since in theology Smith was in hearty agreement with Evangelical Calvinism, no charge of heresy could be established. Eventually, however, in 1881, a majority, angry at his persistence and frightened at his teaching which they could not get condemned, relieved him of his functions, not as a disciplinary measure, involving church censure, but merely in exercise of its discretionary control over the colleges, and with a careful disclaimer of decision upon the matters of scholarship involved. Ten years later the Assembly was again violently divided on the cases of Professors Marcus Dods, and Alexander Balmain Bruce (qq.v.). Dr. Dods had attacked the antiquated theory of verbal inspiration, had met with encouraging words inquirers unable to accept the full doctrine of the church especially in regard to the resurrection, and had spoken of the possibility of truth lying in more than one theory of the Atonement. Dr. Bruce in his *Kingdom of God* (Edinburgh, 1889) had touched on the problems presented by the existence of four different and sometimes differing Gospel records. After long and heated discussion the assembly passed motions declaring its adherence to certain specified doctrines which no one had attacked and admonishing the professors in words meant more to reassure the Highlands than to edify the professors then under fire. These controversies in one way played a useful part by awakening general interest in the advance of Biblical scholarship. An attempt to renew the controversy by an attack upon Professor George Adam Smith in 1902 hopelessly collapsed. On the other hand, the passing of the Declaratory Act in 1892 offended an ultra-conservative Highland section which broke off to form the Free Presbyterian Church (see below, 4).

5. Free Church; Development; Theological Controversies.

The year 1900 is another historic date in Scottish church history. Immediately after the Disruption vague hopes for a union of the Free Church and existing "voluntary" churches were expressed; the feeling in favor of this grew, and in 1863 committees of both churches were appointed. In regard to doctrine, worship, and organization no obstacles were discovered, but in regard to the almost purely theoretical question of relation of the civil magistrate to the church sharp differences became clear. The great majority of the Free Church were in favor of leaving this an open question in the proposed united church and the standards of the United Presbyterian Church contained no pronouncement on the point in dispute. A determined minority of the Free Church, however, held that the question of the duty of the civil magistrate to spend public money on the maintenance of an Established Church was an essential part of the doctrine of the Free Church and in 1873 the majority yielded. A Mutual Eligibility Act, however, was passed, providing for the passage of ministers from one church to the other. The Free Church had been joined in 1854 by most of the Original Seceders (see above, 1, § 2). The Reformed Presbyterians (Cameronians, see above, § 2) had been invited in 1864 to share in the proposed Union. Their views regarding the civil magistrate were satisfactory even to the constitutionalist minority in the Free Church and, after the collapse of the negotiations with the United Presbyterian Church, conferences were reopened with them and a union between them and the Free Church was consummated in 1876. The action of the minority in thwarting the Union was partly stimulated by the movement in the Established Church toward the abolition of patronage. It was felt by some that a wider union on the basis of a reformed establishment was within sight. Such hopes were disappointed, since approaches by the Established Church (see above, 1) in 1878 were met in 1886 on the part of the Free Church by propositions in favor of disestablishment and disendowment. The Established Church refused to negotiate except on the understanding that the Establishment basis would be preserved. The Free Church demanded an open conference without reservation.

6. Movements toward Union.

This failure concentrated hopes the more definitely upon a union of Free and United Presbyterian churches. In 1896 union committees were appointed. The negotiations took four years, the chief problems being the conciliation and reassurance of the constitutionalist party in the Free Church which suspected the liberal tendencies at work, and the settlement of details personal and financial regarding the consolidation of offices, colleges, and other agencies. Everything was harmoniously arranged, and it seemed up to the last as if the small conservative section of the Free Church would give

7. Union of 1900.

way. The Union was consummated in Edinburgh in October, 1900, amid a scene of great enthusiasm and the congratulations conveyed by deputies from sister churches all over the world.

8. Free Church Minority; Legal Proceedings; Settlement.

A small minority, however, including twenty-seven ministers, declined to enter the United Free Church, and began legal proceedings in the courts, claiming as the true Free Church (see below, 3) to retain her whole property both central and congregational. In the Scottish courts the decisions were in favor of the united church, but upon appeal the dissenting minority were declared by the House of Lords in August, 1904, to be the true representatives of the Free Church, and to them the trustees were ordered to convey the whole property. The main ground of the decision was that the Church of Scotland before the disruption had no power of altering her creed or standards and that the Free Church in separating in 1843 claimed no new rights in that respect; and that, in particular, Dr. Chalmers the Moderator, having in 1843 repudiated voluntaryism and made clear that the Free Church adhered to the sections of the Westminster Confession of Faith regarding the duty of the civil magistrate, the Free Church of 1900 had no power to carry over its property into a church which left open in its constitution the question of the right of an Establishment. The contention of the United Free Church, that the church as a church had an inherent right to modify her subordinate standards, was rejected by five to two, the majority of the Lords defining the church in its relation to property, as a trust constituted for once and all by its original constitution as a trust deed. The scope of the decision was staggering. The whole funds and buildings of the Free Church at home and abroad were to be handed over to the inhabitants of the remoter northern districts. In the United Free Church indignation ran high, both at the grounds of the judgment and at the prospect of having their whole work crippled by the loss of property and funds. An emergency fund was at once raised which eventually reached nearly £200,000 and an advisory committee was formed to guide matters during the crisis. It was obvious that the victorious Free Church had neither capacity nor resources in men or money to administer the huge foreign missionary organization, and it is to their credit that they did not attempt to enforce the judgment abroad. At home, however, they set about the business of organization with energy. In some cases where congregations were formed United Free Churchmen were ejected from churches and manses. They prohibited the use of hymns and organs, which latter they announced their intention of destroying in churches of which they took possession. Public opinion demanded parliamentary action, and an Act was passed suspending all further legal proceedings and appointing a commission of inquiry. On its report that the Free Church was not in a position to administer the property in terms of the trusts, an act was passed in 1904 appointing an executive commission to dispose of the whole property so as best to secure its proper use. In cases of congregational property the Frees were to get the churches where they could show that they had one-third of the members and adherents at the time of the Union in 1900. The result has been for the most part to set aside the legal judgment. All the missions have been entrusted to the United Church. The Assembly Hall and all the colleges have been assigned to them and most congregations confirmed in their use of their churches. Nevertheless the United Church had to suffer heavy loss. The valuable offices in Edinburgh were assigned to the Free Church for use as a college. Some large churches in the south and over a hundred in the Highlands went to the Free Church, and the United Free Church was faced by the need for immediate expenditure on building to the extent of about £150,000. Out of college incomes an annual charge of £3,000 is set aside for the Free Church college, and other heavy charges for their benefit made on the funded capital.

9. Results; Present Position.

One good effect of the judgment was to call forth expression of the loyalty of the church. The former United Presbyterian and Free branches were welded by the shock as years of tranquil existence might not have effected. Then the misgivings inevitably arising regarding past history and procedure produced criticism that will be fruitful. There is a desire that laymen, who have to pay the cost, should have more to say in church councils. The financial stress stimulates desire for economy and business methods, and many small adjacent churches have been united. The disastrous spectacle of ecclesiastical strife has produced a revulsion in favor of still larger reunion, and an era of hearty cooperation is surely in sight, while especially among the laity there is a strong desire for a union of all Presbyterians in Scotland. The future position of the church in regard to its right to alter its standards was made clear by an act of Assembly in 1905 (see below, § 11) which was presented to Parliament. In certain directions the work of the church, especially in expansion, has been hampered by the crisis, but on the whole the home activity and foreign enterprises and the work of the colleges have been carried on without slackening. The adjustments of organization left incomplete at the Union have now been completed and especially in 1907 the final merging of Sustentation and Augmentation Funds into one "Central Fund" for the support of the ministry has been accomplished. In regard to theological scholarship the leaders of the church are now in full sympathy with free and fearless inquiry, and scholarship has been amply proved to go along with hearty evangelical zeal. The home-mission problem is being approached in new ways. Suburban church extension proceeds; in Glasgow and Aberdeen large institutional churches have been started in slum districts, and the extension of this feature in other large towns in the near future is probable. The organization is, of course, Presbyterian, the series of ecclesiastical bodies proceeding in order from the kirk-session through the presbytery and synod to the general assembly. Local financial affairs are managed either by a court of deacons ordained for

life, with whom are associated ex officio the session, or by a committee of managers elected for a term, meeting apart from the session. The salary of the minister is guaranteed by the Central Fund up to a fixed minimum, at present £160, which is often supplemented by the congregation. The affairs of the church are managed from large central offices by permanent secretaries and representative committees of Assembly. There are three colleges in Edinburgh, Glasgow, and Aberdeen, with 133 regular students and 42 visitors largely graduates of American colleges.

10. Statistics and Missions.

The United Free Church reports 1,631 congregations with 27 Congregational missions, 506,088 members, 35,199 elders and deacons, 2,369 Sunday-schools with 25,385 teachers and 241,160 scholars, a total income of £1,044,093, with a home missionary income of about £130,000, and from native and foreign sources about £85,000. Apart from native agents there are at work 118 ordained missionaries, 35 medical missionaries, most of whom are also ordained, 103 women missionaries, 52 teachers, artizans, etc., besides 135 missionaries' wives. In India since 1904 all Presbyterian missions have been united in the Presbyterian Church in India with 372 elders and 14,830 communicants, under six mission councils, viz., Bengal, Santalia, Western India, Nagpur, Madras, and Rajputana. In China the Manchurian council works in nine district circuits, among other places at Mukden and Hiaoyang, and is rapidly training up a native ministry. The native church showed heroic steadfastness during the Boxer troubles and is now rapidly growing. In Africa are the Kaffraria council with over a dozen stations and the Lovedale institution with a roll of 715 pupils; the Transkei council, with Blythswood, and nearly twenty stations; the Natal council; the Old Calabar Mission begun in 1846, now having 754 members and 50 native agents; and the extraordinarily successful Livingstonia Mission, which has founded a Christian civilization round the shores of Lake Nyassa. In the New Hebrides there is now a strong native church, some islands being entirely Christian. In the West Indies the Jamaica mission council controls an organization which is partly organized as a church, partly as a system of mission stations, and the Trinidad Mission Council works similarly in connection with the Presbyterian Church of Canada among English-speaking creoles and the coolie population.

11. Doctrine and Constitution.

The doctrinal position of Scottish Presbyterianism has never been defined *de novo* since the Westminster Confession approved it in 1646. The statement of the present position of the United Free Church is contained in the Acts of 1905 regarding spiritual independence, and of 1900 effecting the Union, which makes approving references to the historic documents of the various branches of the church and sanctions the declarations which had been made from time to time regarding the terms of adhesion to the Westminster Confession.

The act of 1905 of the United Free Church as to doctrine was passed with a view to making clear the conditions on which the church took back the property alienated by the decision of 1904 and is designed to put beyond all doubt for all time the power of the church to define her own creed and discipline. It contains these words: "That this church continues to claim that the church of Christ has under him as her only Head independent and exclusive jurisdiction and power of legislating in all matters of doctrine, worship, discipline, and government of the church, including therein the right from time to time to alter, change, add to or modify her constitution and laws, subordinate standards and church formulas and to determine and declare what these are." This is further declared to be a fundamental principle and rule of the United Free Church, the power of uniting with other churches being explicitly mentioned and the words added "always in conformity with the Word of God and also with the safeguards for deliberate action and legislation in such cases provided by the church herself, of which conformity the church herself acting through her courts shall be the sole judge." The Act of Union prescribes the formula for signature upon ordination. The Bible is in the first question given its place as supreme standard as being the word of God, and the only rule of faith and life. The second question, relating to acceptance of the doctrine of the church as set forth in the Confession of Faith is construed with relation to (1) the Act of Free Church, 1846, disclaiming "intolerant or persecuting principles" and repudiating any such interpretation of the confession; (2) the Declaratory Act of the United Presbyterian Church of 1879, which also disdains intolerant principles, asserts in connection with the confessional doctrine of election the free offer of salvation to all, and the responsibility of each for its rejection, and that the former doctrine is held in harmony with the truth that God is not willing that any should perish and with human responsibility; (3) The Declaratory Act of the Free Church in 1892, which as regards predestination says the church does not hold the confession as teaching the preordination of men to death irrespective of their own sin. Other references are (4) to the Disruption Protest and Claim of Right which assert spiritual independence on matters now covered by the Act of 1905; (5) to the Basis of Union of 1847 which adopts the Westminster Confession with reservation of persecuting principles, lays stress on the missionary duty of the Church and the obligation of free-will offerings for that end and for the support of the ministry. Another declaration of the 1900 Assembly sanctions the Larger and Shorter Catechisms as "manuals of religious instruction long approved and held in honor by the people of both churches." With the exception and modifications thus summarized the theology of the United Free Church is the Calvinistic doctrine of the Westminister Confession.

ROBERT WILLIAM STEWART.

3. Free Church of Scotland: The Free Church of Scotland began its separate existence at the disruption of the Church of Scotland in 1843 (see above, 1, § 4), under the leadership of Dr. Thomas Chalmers. In October, 1900, a large majority of its ministers, elders, and members united with the United Presbyterian Church and

formed the United Free Church (see above, 2). A minority remained apart from the union because of dissatisfaction with the basis on which it was effected, and claimed to be the true successors of the disruption fathers. They also raised a claim to the funds and property of the Church. The matter was referred to the law courts. In the Outer and Inner Houses of the Court of Session in Scotland judgment was given unanimously in favor of the present United Free Church. On an appeal being taken to the House of Lords, a decision was obtained in August, 1904, by five to two, in favor of the Free Church. On the ground of the inability of the Free Church to execute all the trusts, parliament intervened. A royal commission was appointed to inquire and to report. In 1904, the Churches (Scotland) Act was passed, and by a commission appointed under said Act, the property in question was allocated between the Free and United Free Churches.

Like the other Presbyterian churches, the Free Church is governed by church sessions, presbyteries, synods, and general assembly. The general assembly—the supreme court of the church—meets annually in Edinburgh in the month of May. There are, at home, five synods, twelve presbyteries, 160 congregations, and about thirty mission stations. In Africa, there is one presbytery with one European and two native pastors, and ten catechists.

The majority of the home congregations are located in the counties of Caithness, Sutherland, Ross, Inverness, Argyle, and Bute. Students for the ministry are required to attend a full undergraduate course of study at one of the universities, and a full course of four years in divinity in the church's own Theological College in Edinburgh, which has a staff of a principal and five professors. In Edinburgh are also located the offices of the church. The endowments of the church are: For the maintenance of the Theological College, including bursaries, £92,000; for undergraduate bursaries, £11,000; for foreign missions, £25,000; for aged and infirm ministers and retired professors, £35,000; for the support of the ministry and lay agents, £210,000; for the general purposes of administration and management, £40,000; for the education of sons and daughters of ministers and missionaries, £6,000; for the widows and orphans of ministers and missionaries, a fund of over £500,000 is administered by trustees for the benefit of both the Free and United Free Churches and the annuity payable to widows is £44, to each child while under eighteen years of age £24, with £12 additional when the mother is also dead. The interest of these endowments is supplemented by free-will offerings from the people amounting in all, for the various schemes of the church, to about £12,000 annually. These contributions are apart from local congregational funds which are used locally and do not pass through the books of the general treasurer of the church in Edinburgh. J. K CAMERON.

4. Free Presbyterian Church of Scotland: In 1892 a Declaratory Act was passed by the general assembly of the Free Church of Scotland. Strong opposition had been offered to this measure by the constitutionalist party, and hopes were entertained that this dissatisfaction would lead to its repeal. But these hopes were doomed to disappointment. At the following assembly (1893) a protest was entered against the Act. This action was a virtual denial of the jurisdiction of the supreme court and the result was that two ministers were deprived of their churches and manses. These were subsequently joined by a number of students who were dissatisfied with the advanced teaching from the professorial chairs of the Free Church. In August, 1893, Donald MacFarlane, and Donald MacDonald, ministers, with Alexander MacFarlane, elder, met at Portree, Isle of Skye, and constituted themselves a presbytery, under the name of the Free Church Presbytery of Scotland; (" Free Church " was afterwards abandoned for " Free Presbyterian " to avoid legal complications). At this meeting a Deed of Separation was drawn up with reasons. These were, that the Free Church (1) had passed resolutions having as their object the abandonment of the national recognition of religion; (2) it had sanctioned the use of uninspired hymns and instrumental music in divine worship; (3) it tolerated office-bearers who did not hold the whole doctrine of the Confession of Faith especially in regard to the entire perfection of Holy Scripture; (4) by passing the Declaratory Act of 1892, it destroyed the integrity of the Confession as understood by the Disruption fathers; and (5) the majority of her office-bearers had become voluntaries. While renouncing the jurisdiction of the Free Church of 1893, the signatories solemnly promised to abide by the constitution and standards of the Free Church as settled in 1843. Briefly stated it may be said, the Free Presbyterian Church stands for the doctrine of the infallibility of Holy Scripture, the national recognition of religion, purity of worship (the exclusive use of the Psalms in divine worship without the aid of instrumental music), and, generally speaking, for the whole doctrine of the Confession of Faith. The church's office-bearers subscribe to the Free Church documents of 1843 and the Deed of Separation referred to above. There are three presbyteries; the supreme court being the synod which meets twice a year; in July at Inverness and in November at Glasgow. The congregations and preaching-stations number about seventy. These are supplied by thirteen ordained ministers with the help of students and lay missionaries and catechists. The church's sphere of labor is confined chiefly to the Highlands, though there are congregations in Edinburgh, Glasgow (two), and London. There is a colonial mission in Ontario and Manitoba, Canada, with an ordained missionary, and a foreign mission station near Bembesi, Matabeleland, South Africa, presided over by an ordained native missionary. The students of the church are expected to undergo a four-years' university course, and a four-years' theological course. The Rev. John R. MacKay, M. A., Inverness, and Rev. D. Beaton, Wick, act as theological tutors. The ministry are entirely dependent upon the voluntary contributions of the people for support; the ministerial salary being £140 ($700) per annum. D. BEATON.

5. Reformed Presbyterian Church: This Church is the legitimate descendant and representative of the Covenanted Church of Scotland in its period of greatest purity, the period of the second Reformation (1638–1649). Holding the continuing obligation of the national Covenants (see COVENANTERS) it maintains the doctrine of the universal supremacy of Christ and the authority of his Word both in Church and State. In doctrinal belief it adheres to the theology of the Westminster Confession; in worship it uses exclusively the Psalms of Scripture, without instrumental music. It objects to all secret oathbound societies. Its members decline to swear allegiance to any civil constitution that disowns or dishonors Christ: this is its historic position of political dissent both in Britain and America. The Covenanters suffered cruel persecutions under the Stuarts, and welcomed the Revolution of 1688; but as in Scotland under the Revolution Settlement the national Church was substantially a creature of the State, and prelacy in England and Ireland was registered in the national constitution, they never joined the Revolution Church. For sixteen years, as "the United Societies," they were without a minister. In 1706 they were joined by the Rev. John McMillan from the Established Church, and the first presbytery was constituted in 1743. They continued to increase till 1863, when there were six presbyteries and a synod, with about forty ministers, a theological seminary, a prosperous mission in the New Hebrides, and a Jewish mission in London. In 1863 a disruption took place, the majority resolving to abide no longer by the historic position of the church. That majority joined the Free Church thirteen years after. The minority, adhering to the recognized testimony of the church, constituted themselves the Reformed Presbyterian Synod, and were acknowledged in the civil courts as the legitimate representatives of the Reformed Presbyterian Church. It has now nine ministers, and it conducts, along with the Reformed Presbyterian Synod in Ireland, prosperous missions in Antioch and Alexandretta. It is in ecclesiastical fellowship with the Reformed Presbyterian Church in America (see below, VIII., 7). JOHN MCDONALD.

6. United Original Secession Church: This church dates from 1733, when four ministers of the National Church, Ebenezer Erskine, William Wilson, Alexander Moncrieff, and James Fisher felt

1. Origin and Divisions.

in conscience constrained to withdraw from the courts of that church (see above, 1, § 4, 2, § 2). The reasons for their withdrawal were found both in the administrative and the doctrinal sides of the church's life. The exercise of lay patronage, forcing ministers upon churches even with the aid of the military, and the defects in the teaching and preaching of some professors and ministers, lacking, as it did, the Evangelical note which they judged vital to the interest of true religion, seemed to require this action. They sought not only to maintain this Evangelical note in their own teaching, but to lift up a public testimony against the departures from it in the Church. Ebenezer Erskine (q.v.) did this in a sermon preached at a meeting of a synod, and he and those who openly sympathized with him were suspended from their office as ministers. They formed themselves into a presbytery at Gairney Bridge in Fifeshire (where a monument commemorating the event has been erected), but a presbytery of the Church of Scotland, which, because of untoward circumstances, was in a condition of secession from its courts. Hence, the name Secession. The movement was popular, and other presbyteries were formed, which were linked together by a synod, which met annually. The name "Church" was purposely avoided because the Seceders regarded themselves as a part of the Church of Scotland, though compelled for the sake of conscience to carry on their work in a state of secession. The history of this movement is marked by many divisions. The first cause of division was an oath which was exacted from the burgesses of certain cities in the country, in which they promised support to the religion established in the realm. Some thought that this oath could be taken in consistency with the position which they had taken, the religion to which approval was given being that sanctioned in the constitution of the country. Others thought that the taking of it meant approval of the things that the church had recently tolerated and so involved unfaithfulness to the protest which they had made against these things. The contention resulted in a separation in 1747 into different camps,—the Burgher and the Anti-Burgher. After this, the question between Church and State began to be agitated in both these churches. The result was difference of view, some taking the secular standpoint in relation to the State, and others bitterly opposing it. They who thought that the State should confine its attention to secular affairs and leave the church alone, were called New Lights, and the others received the name Old Lights.

This line of cleavage in the opinion regarding the State formed in the two branches of the church led to

2. Unions; Statistics.

the different parties in them which held similar views drawing toward one another, and finally to a union on the New Light Basis, known as the "voluntary basis," in 1820, leaving sections that adhered to the principle of State-churchism, in separate ecclesiastical organizations. In this union is found the beginning of the United Presbyterian Church (see above, 2). The history of the sturdy fragments left outside this union of 1820, is one of gradual amalgamation, with occasional fragments of the fragments finding their way into larger ecclesiastical bodies. There was a union between those who stood on the ground of State-churchism, and later of those who had long maintained different views about the Burgess oath. It is the result of these unions that is found in the United Original Secession Church, the half of which united with the Free Church in 1852, and the other half still maintains a separate organization. Its platform is the position identified with the second Reformation, with the ideal of a nation and a church in covenant with God to promote his cause. It is a small body consisting of twenty-five congregations, grouped in five presbyteries, with a synod as the supreme court meeting annually. It has 19 ministers, one probationer, and

about 3,600 members. Its theological hall in Glasgow is under the care of two professors and one lecturer. Its annual income is between two and three thousand pounds sterling. The total income of congregations from all sources amounted last year to £5,863, an average contribution from each member of £1,12, 6d. It supports a vigorous, well-equipped mission at Seoni in the central province of India, an ordained male missionary, a fully qualified female missionary, a trained zenana visitor, and a large number of native catechists and Christian workers. R. MORTON.

II. Presbyterian Church of England: Presbyterianism, with its popular government, is at the opposite pole of church life from the absolutism of Rome. Hence at the Reformation its principles were much favored in England though but imperfectly understood, while the episcopacy of Edward VI. was so mild that in his reign no man suffered for dissenting from the newly established church. Under Mary every form of Protestantism was suppressed, when Episcopalians and Presbyterians alike fled to the continent for safety. On the accession of Elizabeth, the exiles returned to find themselves but little better off than they had been under Mary, for the queen was of too despotic a nature to allow any to differ from her views. The Puritan or Presbyterian section of the church, which desired government by elders, was now called on to suffer, yet Presbyterian principles spread so widely that, in 1570, Bishop Sandys writing to Bullinger at Zurich gave him, in a summary of the views which were spreading among the ministers and members of the Episcopal Church, an excellent epitome of Presbytery, closely resembling what it is to-day. The Presbyterians at that date numbered, it is said, one hundred thousand. As the result of the queen's oppression, a considerable number of persons "separated" themselves in 1556 from the Established Church, and maintained religious services according to the Presbyterian order, and against these the queen's anger blazed fiercely. Their sufferings did not deter others who still remained in the Church from going still farther and holding conferences or "ministers' meetings," one of which in London deputed in 1572 two of its members to visit Wandsworth, a little village near that city, who there, with the assistance of the lecturer of the parish and a number of leading Puritan church members, formally organized a "Particular Church" in accordance with Presbyterian order. This was the first open formation in England of a church different from that which had been established. In a surprisingly short time hundreds of similar churches were organized throughout the country, generally, as *ecclesiolæ in ecclesia*, revealing the hold Presbyterian principles had taken of the people, and that a new chapter in the history of England was about to open.

1. Presbyterian Principles Informally Established.

James recognized the situation and, determining to crush it, held immediately after his accession the Hampton Court Conference (q.v.), ostensibly to harmonize the views of both parties, but really to give himself an opportunity of saying that he would "harry" out of the land the members of the church in which he had been brought up. Led by Bancroft, the episcopal church now gathered itself together, separated from the continental Reformers, and became identified with the sacramental system. Under Charles I. Laud, who said he regarded Presbytery as worse than Romanism and whose watchword was "thorough," promoted those Star Chamber prosecutions of the Non-conformists which form a black page in English history. The king's own conduct drove the great mass of the Presbyterian members of the church into the ranks of the Parliamentarians, while the subsequent alliance of the parliament with the Scottish army, the adoption of the Solemn League and Covenant, together with the decisions of the Westminster Assembly in 1647 A.D., resulted in the overthrow of the episcopal church and its replacement in the Establishment by that of presbytery. That assembly was the latest of the great councils of the Christian Church, and by it the Calvinistic system of doctrine was expressed in a Confession of Faith, and its system of polity in a Directory of Church Government. The Establishment being now Presbyterian, the parish churches were occupied by Presbyterian ministers, yet after all, the Presbyterian polity was accepted largely only in London and Lancashire. In the former, indeed, a provincial synod embracing presbyteries with their constituent church sessions had been formed, but before long all had come to an end. Presbytery had no leaders competent to resist Cromwell and the army, and by means of this, or at its dictation, Cromwell replaced presbytery by independency. Shortly afterward came the Restoration when, under the reign of a king who on two occasions had sworn the Solemn League and Covenant, the Presbyterians expected some improvement in their condition, a change which Charles had no intention of granting. In 1662 he therefore sanctioned the Act of Uniformity, (see UNIFORMITY, ACTS OF), enjoining reordination of every minister not episcopally ordained,—adherence to everything in the Book of Common Prayer, obedience to the ordinary (bishop), abjuration of the Solemn League and Covenant, with an additional oath declaring that it was not lawful under any circumstances to take up arms against the king. More than 2,000 parish ministers refused obedience to the Act and, on August 24th (St. Bartholomew's Day), resigning their congregations, walked out of their manses, leaving their pulpits empty. By the subsequent Conventicle Act (q.v.), these men were forbidden to preach to their former congregations, and by the Five Mile Act (q.v.), could not live within five miles of their former parishes. Under these conditions, Presbyterianism ceased to be a visible religious force in English national life, with a result that was inevitable. Never having had any central organization like a general assembly to bring its members together and to keep them in connection with one another, these drifted into fragments and the vitality of the system was lost. In 1688 came the Revolution, when, the aim of all being to secure in

2. Royal and Parliamentary Opposition.

addition to their civil liberties the "Protestant religion," no special effort was made by the non-Anglicans to obtain relief from their disabilities. All branches of non-conformity now acted as practically a single community, under the "Happy Union" arrangement of 1691, and as no authority existed to enforce the Westminster Confession or the Directory of Church Government, Presbyterianism, with its polity and doctrine at loose ends, came within a few decades to be, in many cases, but another name for Unitarianism, a misrepresentation now happily removed.

Not a few of the congregations that left the parish churches in 1662 had provided themselves with small chapels for their religious services. A dozen of these still exist, while under the Indulgence of 1672, nearly an equal number were built before the close of the century. As separate congregations these would probably have survived, but another element has come into England, by means of which nearly all these old Presbyterians have become constituent members of an organized and Evangelical Presbyterian Church. Scottish Presbyterians found their way to London probably as early as the days of Elizabeth, and, by the close of the Commonwealth period, must have been numerous in London. A congregation of such was formed in that city, in the reign of Charles II., while others soon followed in the same city and elsewhere. These, however, owed their existence entirely to the action of the individuals composing them, and were based on nationality and Presbyterianism, having no official connection with the Scottish general assembly. By 1772 the London congregations of this character numbered seven, by which time their ministers had formed themselves into "The Scots Presbytery of London." The "Presbytery," however, while claiming "communion" with the Church of Scotland, had no ecclesiastical connection with it, and was really little more than a "ministers' meeting," admitting occasionally into its fellowship ministers of Old English Presbyterian and of Secession congregations. In 1836, this presbytery changed its title to that of "The London Presbytery in Communion with the Church of Scotland," while in 1839 the Scottish Assembly counseled its members to organize themselves as "The Presbyterian Synod in England." In 1742, the Scottish Associate Synod had organized congregations at Newcastle and other places and as the number of these increased not a few of the Old English Presbyterians joined with them. These were formed into presbyteries in connection with the United Secession Church of Scotland (see above, I., 2). In 1843 came the fateful Disruption of the Scottish Establishment, when the "Presbyterian Synod in England" divided. The majority cast in its lot with the Scottish Free Church and retained the name of "The Presbyterian Synod in England," while the minority remained in connection with the Scottish National Church, and formed itself into "The Scottish Presbytery in London in connection with the Church of Scotland." In 1850 this presbytery, along with two others that had been formed, was organized as "The Synod of the Church of Scotland in England" and consists today of some 3,500 communicants, forming three presbyteries, and meeting annually in a general synod.

3. Infusion of Scotch Elements.

The Free Church "Presbyterian Synod in England" promoted evangelistic work up and down the country, and was in friendly relations with the Old Presbyterian and the United Secession congregations, so that, in 1863, the United Presbyterian Church in Scotland formed its congregations in England into the "English Synod." The way was thus left open for a union between this and the "Presbyterian Synod in England." Such union took place in 1876, when the uniting churches took the name of the "Presbyterian Church of England," and this has since then continued its Christian activities and numerical growth. In 1910, this church consisted of 85,774 communicants, organized into 350 congregations, forming 12 presbyteries, which meet annually in a general synod. Its contributions in 1908 amounted to £306,958. It has in Cambridge for its theological students a handsome residential college which is partly affiliated with the university, while it sustains an extensive foreign mission in South China and on Formosa, with a smaller one in India, and one to the Jews at Aleppo.

4. The Present Church in England.

G. D. Mathews.

III. Ireland.—**1. The Presbyterian Church in Ireland:** Presbyterians did not obtain any considerable footing in Ireland until the time of the Ulster Plantation under James I. (1603–25). The settlers, most of whom were Scottish Presbyterians, began to arrive in 1610; Presbyterian ministers began to come from Scotland in 1613, and for a time they were appointed without reordination to vacant charges in the Established Church, but this period of toleration was followed by a time of persecution which was subsequently renewed at various times. In 1641 there was a rebellion in Ireland, in the course of which thousands of Protestants were massacred. In 1642 a Scottish army was sent over to quell the rebellion. Each Scottish regiment had a chaplain and a regular kirk session selected from the officers. The first presbytery consisting of five chaplains and four elders was formed at Carrickfergus on June 10, 1642. Ministers were sent over from Scotland; other presbyteries were formed; and in the time of Cromwell there was a general synod with eighty congregations and seventy ministers. In 1661 sixty-four ministers were ejected from their livings for refusing to conform to the Established Church, and many Presbyterians went to America to escape persecution, among them Francis Makemie (q.v.).

King William III. authorized the payment of £1,200 per annum to the Presbyterian ministers of Ireland in recognition of the loyal support of Presbyterians on his arrival in Ireland in 1690. This may be taken as the beginning of the *Regium donum* which was subsequently increased and continued to be given to ministers till 1869. In the face of many difficulties the church grew and prospered, but toward the end of the first half of the eighteenth century some of the ministers came under

the influence of moderatism (see above, I., 2). A congregation of Seceders was formed in 1741 and in time there came to be a Secession Synod as well as a Synod of Ulster (see below, 3). The ministers of Secession congregations also received a *Regium donum* grant from the government. About 1825 some of the ministers of the Synod of Ulster were known to hold Arian views and there was apprehension of the spread of these views. The Rev. Henry Cooke championed the cause of orthodoxy and under his leadership the Synod of Ulster, by an overwhelming majority, declared in favor of the doctrine of the Trinity. In 1829 seventeen ministers withdrew from the synod and subsequently formed The Remonstrant Synod of Ulster. This paved the way for the union of the two orthodox synods. The Synod of Ulster with 292 congregations and the Secession Synod with 141 congregations united in 1840 and formed the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland.

It is worthy of note that there were Presbyterians in the south of Ireland before the time of the Ulster Plantation. The Rev. Walter Travers, first provost of Trinity College, Dublin, appointed in 1594, was a Presbyterian minister. Its first two elected fellows—James Hamilton, afterward Lord Claneboy, and James Fullerton—were also Presbyterians. The Presbyterians in the south of Ireland outside the Synod of Ulster and the Secession Synod belonged to the Southern Association which in 1809 became the Synod of Munster. In 1840 the orthodox members of this synod withdrew and formed themselves into the Presbytery of Munster, and this presbytery joined the general assembly in 1854.

Since the formation of the general assembly the church has made continuous progress, notwithstanding the heavy drain which emigration has made on its membership. In 1869 the *Regium donum* which amounted to £69. 4s. 8d. per annum for each minister was abolished by the Irish Church Act, but vested interests were respected and the ministers of that time commuted in the interests of the church with the result that a sum of almost £600,000 was received into the church treasury for investment, and the annual income arising therefrom together with the Sustentation-Fund contributions of the people is sufficient to give every minister of a congregation a sum of about £80 per annum. The church reports 657 ministers, 568 congregations, about 106,000 communicants, 1,048 Sunday-schools with 8,240 teachers and 94,735 scholars; two colleges (Belfast and Londonderry) with 15 professors; 26 ministerial, 6 medical, 22 zenana, and 5 lay missionaries in the foreign field; 3 ministerial and 3 female missionaries in connection with the Jewish mission in Hamburg and Damascus; and one ministerial missionary in Spain. The Presbyterian Orphan Society has invested funds amounting to £114,000 and an annual income of over £17,000. The Ministers' Orphan Society has invested funds amounting to more than £18,000 and an annual income of over £900. The Aged and Infirm Ministers' Fund has invested funds amounting to £25,000 and an annual income of about £1,000. An Old Age Fund has been established and its yearly income is about £6,000. There are three funds for widows of ministers—the Secession Widows' Fund paying an annuity of £62, the Southern Association Widows' Fund paying an annuity of £60, and the Synod of Ulster Widows' Fund paying an annuity of £44. The total income of the church from all sources for the year 1907–1908 was £266,000.

W. J. Lowe.

2. Reformed Presbyterian or Covenanting Church of Ireland: This church traces its origin to the Covenanters (q.v.) of Scotland. Some of these who had fled from persecution in Scotland settled in the northeast part of the island, and were the founders of the Covenanting Church in Ireland. They had occasional visits from ministers of their native land; but these were few and far between. For fully forty years a separate existence was maintained by the "Society people," as the Covenanters were called, without the aid of a minister, by means of fellowship meetings. A presbytery was organized in 1792, and a synod, with twelve ministers, in 1811. The year 1840 witnessed the withdrawal of a number of congregations and ministers through a controversy regarding the power of the civil ruler. Recently some of these congregations have returned, and some have joined the Presbyterian Church of Ireland. At present there are thirty-six congregations in four presbyteries, thirty-two ministers, and over 3,900 members connected with the synod. With the exception of one in Liverpool, these congregations are all in the province of Ulster. The Standards of the church are the Westminster Confession and Catechisms, together with the *Testimony*, in which the church's distinctive position is clearly defined. In this latter is set forth the duty of covenanting; with the continuing obligations of the National Covenant and Solemn League and Covenant (see Covenanters). The Reformed Presbyterian Church uses only the book of Psalms without any instrumental accompaniment in the service of praise; and the office-bearers and members refuse to take the parliamentary oath, or to vote at parliamentary elections. No one engaged in the manufacture or sale of intoxicating drink is admitted to her communion, nor are members of secret oathbound societies.

There are two foreign mission stations—Antioch and Alexandretta—in Syria, with two ordained and three female missionaries and fifteen native helpers; a colonial mission in Geelong, Australia; and an Irish mission with two colporteurs disseminating the Scripture and other religious books chiefly among Roman Catholics. There is a Theological Hall in Belfast with three professors, where students are trained for the ministry. The course consists of three sessions of five months each. Students are required to have a degree in arts before being admitted to the Hall. The church has a Congregational Aid Fund, the object of which is to assist weaker congregations; an Aged and Infirm Ministers' Fund, from which retired ministers have been receiving £75 per annum; a Ministers' Widows' and Orphans' Fund, and a recently inaugurated General Widows' and Orphans' Fund. None of the congregations are large, and

ministers' salaries range from £100 to £250 yearly; nearly every congregation has a manse, of which the minister has the use free of rent. The synod has nearly £20,000 of invested funds, most of which has been left as legacies by members of the church. From this and from congregational contributions for different purposes the yearly income is about £6,500. JOHN LYND.

3. Secession Church in Ireland: The Secession movement in Scotland spread to Ireland and established itself widely in the north of that country. The divisions and unions of Scotland had their counterparts in Ireland, with modifications caused by the different environment. The present "Presbyterian Church in Ireland" is the fruit of the union of 1840 (see above, 1). Some did not enter this united body because they did not think that in the basis of union there was a sufficient guaranty for purity of doctrine, and because in it the platform of the covenanted Reformation had been abandoned. They are few in number, but they exist as a separate organization under the name of the Associate Synod of Ireland or the Presbyterian Synod of Ireland Distinguished by the Name Seceder. There are six congregations, and five ministers, grouped into two presbyteries, with a synod which meets annually. A fraternal union between this church and the Secession Church in Scotland (see above, I., 6) was established in 1872. R. MORTON.

IV. Welsh Calvinistic Methodist Connection: This body, frequently called The Presbyterian Church of Wales, and generally known in Wales as Y Corff, "The Body," came formally into being at a small synod—the first quarterly association, as it came to be counted—held at

1. Origin. Watford, near Cardiff, Jan. 5–6, 1743, under the presidency of George Whitefield, who had been specially invited to attend by Howel Harris (q.v.), of Trevecca, near Brecon, the leader of the religious revival in Wales and the founder of Calvinistic Methodism. Howel Harris, who was spiritually awakened in 1735 by one of Tillotson's writings and by a solemn antecommunion sermon in the church of Talgarth, was one of the most remarkable men of his time; his indomitable energy and unflinching courage are evinced by his ceaseless itineraries over much of Wales and even parts of England and his fearless preaching before furious and hostile mobs. Owing to various doctrinal and personal disputes he was excluded from the fellowship of his coworkers in 1750, the year of the "Rupture"; in 1752 he established at his own home at Trevecca a religious and industrial community consisting of families and individuals drawn from many parts of Wales; here he showed remarkable skill as a ruler, steward, and organizer. The real birthplace of Calvinistic Methodism, however, is properly the farmhouse of Gwernos, near Trevecca, where Harris held the first private "Society," or fellowship meeting, for the expression and discussion of spiritual experiences. The "Societies," the monthly association held at Trevecca and other parts of Wales, together with the quarterly associations, are the basis of the organization of the Calvinistic Methodist Church.

Almost simultaneously with the revival inaugurated in Mid-Wales by Harris, a movement wholly independent of it, as both were independent of the revivals in England under Whitefield and

2. Contributory Movements. Wesley, began in Cardiganshire under the powerful preaching of Daniel Rowlands (q.v.), who had been greatly influenced by the Rev. Griffith Jones, of Llanddowror in Carmarthenshire, the apostle of the Welsh circulating schools. The other clergymen who joined the movement included William Williams (q.v.), of Pantycelyn, in Carmarthenshire, who had been converted by the preaching of Harris himself and became the most inspired of all Welsh hymn-writers; Peter Williams, of Carmarthen (1722–96) one of Whitefield's converts, best known for his editions of the Welsh Bible and his annotations thereon; also Howell Davies, of Haverfordwest (1717–70), who with George Whitefield, in Woodstock, Pembrokeshire, in 1754 was the first clergyman to administer the Lord's Supper in a Methodist chapel in Wales. Between 1750 and 1769 Harris was estranged from the Methodists, but in the latter year his reconciliation was brought about at the first anniversary of the college for young men preparing for the ministry which Harris had induced his patroness Selina, Countess of Huntingdon (see HUNTINGDON, SELINA HASTINGS), to establish not far from his house at Trevecca. In 1792, the year after the death of the countess, her college was removed to Cheshunt, but exactly fifty years later, the Welsh Calvinistic Methodists of South Wales, following the example of those of North Wales, who had recently established a school for candidates for the ministry under the Rev. Lewis Edwards at Bala, opened a residential college under the Rev. David Charles, in the old house of Harris, the associations of Methodism with the memory of Harris being thus perpetuated. In 1873, on the centenary of his death, a memorial chapel was erected adjoining the college.

Not until 1811 did the Welsh Calvinistic Methodists take the grave step—on account of which a number of the Methodist clergymen withdrew from the body—of ordaining their own ministers, thus severing their connection with

3. Organization, Activities, and Statistics. the Church of England. Yielding to a strong agitation and the pressure of circumstances, the Rev. Thomas Charles, of Bala in Merionethshire (1755–1814), himself an ejected curate, a convert of Daniel Rowlands, and famous as one of the founders of the British and Foreign Bible Society, agreed to take the responsibility of the new departure in the two associations held that year at Bala and at Llandilo in Carmarthenshire, where a score of "exhorters," as the non-clerical preachers were called, were set apart for the administration of the sacraments. Of the twenty-two thus ordained at least two deserve especial notice, viz., John Elias, the prince of Welsh pulpit orators, and Thomas Jones of Denbigh, the greatest theologian and most versatile writer among the earlier Calvinistic Methodists. Three years later the Home Mission was founded, for the evangelization of, and the support of churches in, the neglected parts of Wales.

In 1823 was published the important document entitled, *The History, Constitution, Rules of Discipline, together with the Confession of Faith, of the Body of the Calvinistic Methodists of Wales*, and in 1826 the Connectional Trust-Deed, securing the legal status of the North and South Wales Associations and of the presbyteries or monthly meetings of the churches in the various counties, was duly registered in the court of chancery. In 1840 the Foreign Missionary Society was established, and the first missionary sent to Khassia Hills in northeast India, a mission being founded in Brittany two years later. In 1864 was held the first general assembly of the denomination for North and South Wales. The body, which meets annually, though not legally incorporated, takes cognizance of the foreign missions, of the elaborate Sunday-school organization of the denomination, and of the books —especially aids to Sunday-school studies—published under its imprimatur. The general assembly is attended by missionaries from India and by representatives from churches in America and Australia. About twenty years ago, through the exertions of the late Rev. John Pugh, the Forward Movement was established for the evangelization of the masses of English-speaking people in the great industrial centers of Wales. The two Calvinistic Methodist theological colleges at Aberystwyth and Bala are associated with the University of Wales, for whose degrees in divinity candidates are prepared.

The greatest name in connection with the educational movement of the church in recent years is that of the Rev. Thomas Charles Edwards (son of the Rev. Lewis Edwards, founder and first principal of Bala College), who after a strenuous career as the first principal of the first university college in Wales (that at Aberystwyth) succeeded his father as principal of the reorganized college at Bala. In 1906 the college founded in 1842 at Trevecca was removed to a handsome edifice presented to the denomination by Mr. David Davies, member of parliament for Montgomeryshire. Preparatory schools are kept at Bala, and at the old college building at Trevecca, in connection with the respective theological colleges. The invested funds of the two colleges amount to £82,000, and Bala college possesses an excellent theological library. The statistics for 1907 were as follows:—1,442 churches, 1,661 chapels and preaching-stations, 1,294 ordained and unordained preachers, 6,281 elders, 185,935 communicants, 849,123 children and candidates, 342,804 communicants and adherents, 1,737 Sunday-schools (1906), and 210,639 Sunday-school teachers and scholars. The total of contributions toward ministry, missions, building funds and other purposes for 1907 was £301,762; the debt remaining on chapels, halls, etc., was £635,659; with total trust funds of over £500,000. Six representatives of the Welsh Calvinistic Methodist Church and six representatives of the Presbyterian Church of England form a united committee of corresponding members having a right to attend, but not to vote at, all synods of the sister-church to which they are respectively accredited. JOHN YOUNG EVANS.

V. South, Central, and West Africa: The Presbyterian Church in South Africa. During the British occupation of South Africa, many settlers found their way thither from Great Britain. Ministers also went out, so that a considerable number of Presbyterian congregations came into existence. In 1897 these formed themselves into "The Presbyterian Church of South Africa," embracing the whole territory of the union, receiving both white and colored members into its fellowship. This church is laying out its strength mainly in church extension, yet it already sustains a mission to the natives in Natal. It exists at present as a general assembly, having 7 presbyteries and 68 congregations, with a communicant church-membership of 12,000.

The Scottish United Free Church has inherited the work of several Scottish Mission Societies that had been engaged in mission work among the natives from about 1820. This church has thus extensive missions chiefly in Kaffraria, with a large educational establishment at Lovedale, in Cape Colony. At this institution there are generally about 800 boys being trained not only for the manual industries, but for the native ministry. All these boys, many of whom are the sons of native chiefs, pay their own boarding charges. The mission has some 40 congregations with 16,000 communicants.

The Swiss Romande Mission has its central establishment at Lorenzo Marques, but carries on a medical, educational, and evangelistic work among the natives, partly in Portuguese, and partly in South African territory, at several important centers such as Delagoa Bay, Pretoria, Elim, and Antioka. It reports about 2,000 communicant church-members.

In Basutoland there is a yet larger native Presbyterian church, where the Paris Missionary Society about fifty years ago commenced a mission. This mission has sixteen European ministers with 13 native ministers who have been carefully trained, and 18,000 communicant members, and is, so far as the native ministers are concerned, entirely self-supporting. The mission also sustains a large number of schools, for which it receives a certain amount of aid from the government.

In Central Africa there are the extensive missions of the Scottish Free Church known as Livingstonia with a synod consisting of about 4,500 communicants, and the Blantyre Mission of the Church of Scotland with its church and 2,000 communicants.

On the West Coast, there is the extensive mission of the United Free Church at Old Calabar, where there is also a presbytery having 2,000 communicants. The French Mission at Congo has 1,500 members, and at Senegal there are also a number of native communicants, while on the Mediterranean coast the French church of Algiers forms organically a part of the Evangelical Reformed Church of France. G. D. MATHEWS.

VI. Australia.—1. New South Wales: The island continent of Australia (q.v.) is nearly as large as Europe. Early visited first by Portuguese and Spanish explorers and then by Dutch traders from Java who called it New Holland, it remained a no-man's land until 1770 when Captain James Cook,

visiting its eastern shore, took possession in the name of Britain and called it New South Wales, giving to the place at which he landed the name of Botany Bay. At first, the district was used as a penal settlement.* Free emigrants, however, also landed, settling at Portland Head near the Hawkesbury River, about thirty miles from the present Sydney. Some of these, being Presbyterians, built a church as early as 1803, the services being conducted by members of the settlement. In 1823 there arrived at Sidney Rev. John Dunmore Lang (q.v.) to whom not only New South Wales but all Australia is perhaps more indebted than to any other of its numerous settlers. A man of rare gifts, indomitable energy, and consecrated to the civil and religious interests of Australia, he repeatedly visited Great Britain to obtain ministers for the new settlements with their increasing population. In this he was so far successful that in 1832 there was formed the Presbytery of New South Wales, from which, however, he withdrew in 1837, and formed, along with those adhering to him, the Synod of New South Wales. In 1840 this breach was apparently healed, and a union effected between the two churches, the united church taking the title of The Synod of Australia in Connection with the Church of Scotland, only, however, to be again divided in 1842 by the withdrawal of The Synod of New South Wales, when the Australian synod sought to strengthen its hands by forming the Presbytery of Melbourne.

In 1843 the Disruption of the Scottish Establishment (see above, I., 1, § 4) compelled the Synod of Australia in connection with the Church of Scotland to consider its position in reference to the two Scottish churches. In 1844 it declared itself independent of either, but on finding at a subsequent meeting in 1845 that it must choose between them, eight members voted to delay action, eight voted in favor of adhering to the Free Church, while six urged continued neutrality. Both the Scottish Churches resented this neutrality when, at a meeting of the synod in 1846, sixteen of its members voted to remain in connection with the Church of Scotland, the remaining six protesting against this action, and withdrawing from the synod. Of these six, four favored the Free Church, three of whom subsequently formed the Synod of Eastern Australia, the fourth going to Victoria and there founding later on the Free Presbytery of Eastern Australia, the other two remaining neutral. The Presbyterianism of the colony was thus divided into four distinct sections—the Synod of Australia in connection with the Church of Scotland, the Synod of Eastern Australia, the Synod of New South Wales or Dr. Lang's friends, and a representative of the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland. Subsequently, the Synod of Eastern Australia united with the Synod of New South Wales and then, in 1865, the Synod of Australia joined this united body, the doubly united church taking the name of The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of New South Wales. A small section of the Synod of Eastern Australia, however, stood aloof and took the name of The Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia. The united church at once took active measures for the establishing of a theological hall for their divinity students, and thus St. Andrew's College at Sydney came into existence which, while altogether under the control of the church, was affiliated to the University of Syndey. A Sustentation Fund was also instituted to provide suitable ministerial support, while home-mission work among the aborigines and among the Chinese, and foreign mission work in India and on the New Hebrides, together with an Aged Ministers' Fund, soon became regular schemes of the church. The population of New South Wales is 1,591,673, of whom 156,000 are reported as Presbyterians. The church is organized in 15 presbyteries, 166 congregations, 377 church-buildings with accommodation for 70,000 worshippers, and 18,000 communicant members, with contributions of £75,000 annually.

2. Queensland: This state was originally a portion of New South Wales and began its career in 1824, under the British flag, also as a penal settlement. Free settlers were, however, permitted to enter in 1844, while in 1859 the territory was formed into a state under its present name. Its great variety of soil and climate permit the growth of very varied crops. Its grassy plains support countless flocks of sheep, and with its mineral wealth ever lead to new settlements. Presbyterian services were first commenced at Brisbane, the present capital, in 1847, a congregation being formally organized in 1849. Ministers from different Presbyterian churches in Great Britain having found their way to the colony, they formed in 1863 the Presbytery, subsequently the Synod, of Queensland changing this title, in 1869, for that of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Queensland. Labor for the sugar plantations has been largely obtained from China and the New Hebrides Islands whose natives are known as Kanakas. Among both classes of laborers the church has sustained efficient evangelistic and educational missions. The Kanakas have been lately removed back to their native islands on the plea of making Australia a white-man's land. The number of aborigines, who live mainly in the north, has been estimated at 12,000, but the race is so nomadic that this is little more than a guess. The painful fact in connection with these people is their rapid and continuous decrease in number. The resources of the Queensland church are too limited to allow of much foreign mission work, so that its strength is used in church extension on the great territory on which it has been located, and in engaging with special energy in mission work among the aborigines.

In 1901, the population of Queensland amounted to 552,345 of whom 64,000 reported themselves as Presbyterians. The Presbyterian Church consists

* The using of this country as a penal settlement was one of the consequences of American independence. After 1619 convicted prisoners in England were either sent or allowed to go to the United Provinces, but when the American Revolution took place, Britain had to consider her future mode of dealing with such. Captain Cook's report of the country suggested New South Wales as a penal settlement, for the purpose of ridding England of its numerous criminals, as furnishing a safe place of their detention, and as promising a desirable home for time-expired and well-behaved prisoners, giving them a chance of reputable living, and in 1787 the first prisoners reached the colony.

of 5 presbyteries, 99 congregations, and 6,277 communicants, with contributions in 1909 of £22,600.

3. Victoria (formerly Australia Felix): The first Presbyterian minister in this colony was the Rev. James Clow, who went there in 1837, for whom a church was built in 1841. As the great distance between Melbourne and Sydney and certain ecclesiastical differences kept the ministers in the two cities apart, a portion of those at Melbourne formed themselves in 1847 into The Free Presbyterian Synod of Australia Felix, in sympathy with the Free Church of Scotland. Several ministers from the Church of Scotland had, however, landed in the colony and were holding services at different places, while others, from the churches that subsequently formed the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland, had also arrived. In 1850 these latter formed themselves into the United Presbyterian Church or Synod of Australia Felix, and in 1851 organized the two presbyteries of Melbourne and Portland. In 1851, the British Government separated the district known as Australia Felix from New South Wales, making it an independent colony to be known thereafter as Victoria. In 1853, discoveries of extensive gold-bearing lands led to an immediate rush of population into the colony, when the Scottish Free Church sent about a dozen additional ministers to meet the need. The ministrations of these were of great service among the Gaelic-speaking portions of the new settlers, a large number of whom had come from the Scottish Highlands. There were thus three distinct bodies of Presbyterians in the colony: the Presbytery of Melbourne, originally part of the synod of Australia in connection with the Church of Scotland; the United Presbyterian Synod of Australia Felix; and the Free Church Synod of Australia Felix or Victoria. Proposals were made for union between the latter two. After some negotiation the churches declared themselves ready for union on a basis which had been prepared, when, in the mean time, the Presbytery of Melbourne approached the Synod of the Free Church on the subject of union. After correspondence, here also a basis of union was prepared, the Presbytery having declared itself independent of the Synod of Australia and taken the name of The Synod of Victoria, when the two churches united assuming the title of the Synod of the Free Church of Victoria. Difference of opinion, however, emerged as to the relation of the Free Church to its property should the union be effected, while negotiations were being conducted with a view to inducing the United Presbyterians also to enter the union. After concessions on both sides, this object was gained, and in 1859 a union was formed between the Synod of Victoria, The Free Church Synod of Victoria, and the United Presbyterian Synod of Victoria, the united body becoming The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Victoria, consisting of some fifty-five ministers and their congregations, a few congregations connected with some of these churches standing aloof. In 1867, a number of these, however, entered into the general assembly, while, in 1870, the few outstanding United Presbyterian Churches also entered, the Victorian legislature having in that year ceased all payments from state funds to religious communities in the colony.

All the congregations of this general assembly were self-supporting, and had since 1871 employed the Sustentation-Fund system for providing ministerial support. In addition to extensive home-mission work, the church maintains or aids missions in Korea, the New Hebrides, and among the Chinese in Victoria and the aborigines. It possesses a fund for infirm ministers and one for the widows and orphans of ministers. The population of Victoria is 1,271,174, including 202,000 who report themselves as Presbyterians. The church is organized with 15 presbyteries, 207 congregations, 512 churches with seating-provision for 88,000 persons, and a communicant membership of 29,000, whose contributions are £122,700 annually.

4. South Australia: This district remained part of New South Wales until 1837, when it was formed into a separate colony having Adelaide for its capital. Created a free colony, it was distinguished by the absence of any connection—financial or otherwise—between the State government and the various religious communities within its borders. The earliest Presbyterian services were held in connection with the Scottish Associate Synod, to which church application had been made for a minister. One arrived in 1839, and was soon followed by others from different churches. The first presbytery consisted of ministers of the Scottish Free Church and was formed in 1854, assuming the name of The Free Presbyterian Church of South Australia. In 1865 the three churches represented in the colony, the Church of Scotland, the Free Church of Scotland, and the United Presbyterian Church, united in forming the Presbyterian Church of South Australia. In 1886 this title was changed into that of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of South Australia. Besides home-mission work, the church sustains a mission to the aborigines in North Queensland, and aids mission work on the New Hebrides. The population of South Australia is 407,679, 21,000 of whom are Presbyterians; the church is organized in 3 presbyteries, 16 congregations, and 32 church-buildings with accommodation for 7,000 worshippers; communicant members number 2,000.

5. Western Australia: This province includes the whole western shore of the great continent. In 1829 a commercial company planned a settlement on the banks of the Swan river, but when it failed, the British government took over the territory and made it a crown colony. In 1867 it ceased to be such, and in 1890 it received a constitution with responsible government. Presbyterian church services were commenced at Perth in 1878, and shortly afterward at Swan river, while in 1892 there was formed the Presbytery of Western Australia, in connection with the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Victoria. Formed when those ecclesiastical typhoons which had so wasted the other Australian churches had subsided, the career of this church has been one of peaceful if slow development, and began with simple pastoral settlements; about 1890 the discoveries of gold, copper, and lead mines led to a peri-

lous addition to the previous population. Though unable as yet to meet all the demands on her resources, the church has energetically attempted the evangelizing of the state, the different congregations maintaining the closest connection with one another. The great centrifugal storm which had so affected Australian presbyterianism seems to have subsided, and been replaced by one of equal strength but centripetal in its character. This church has numerous church-extension charges, and aids in mission work among the aborigines.

The population is 268,000, of whom 22,000 claim to be Presbyterians. The church reports 3 presbyteries, 19 congregations with 1,400 communicant members, and an income of £8,000 annually.

6. Tasmania: This island was called by its discoverer Van Diemen's Land in honor of the governor-general of the eastern Dutch possessions, but in 1852, on the abolition of the penal system, it received its present name from that of its discoverer Tasman. It is about as large as Ireland. At first it was under the jurisdiction of the authorities of New South Wales, but became a British colony in 1803, and in 1825 was declared an independent colony. Free settlers had, however, immigrated thither previously, and in 1821 these had obtained ministers from the United Associate Presbytery of Edinburgh. The first presbytery, afterwards the Synod of Tasmania, was formed in 1853. The Scottish Disruption of 1843 had no disturbing effect on the relations of the existent ministers, some siding with the Church of Scotland, and others with the newly formed Free Church, none regarding themselves as required to identify themselves with what they considered to be purely a Scottish question and one which did not and could not, in any way, affect Tasmania. This position, however, was not to the liking of all the church-members, nor to that of some of the ministers in the neighboring colony of Victoria. Some of the latter, therefore, crossed over Bass' Strait and in 1853 organized the Free Church Presbytery of Tasmania, to be in close relations with the Scottish Free Church. This action was condemned by the Free Church in Scotland, which refused to enter into friendly relations with this presbytery and urged union between it and the existing Synod of Tasmania. This step, however, the local presbytery refused to take, remaining a separate organization until 1896, when it entered into union with the Synod, which is now known as the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Tasmania. This church has not increased as rapidly as have some of those of Australia. Since Tasmania has neither gold mines nor sheep pastures to render its normal condition specially attractive, it has remained a purely agricultural colony. Presbyterian students for the ministry attend St. Andrew's College at Melbourne or Ormond College at Sydney. Though neither numerically large nor wealthy, it maintains a vigorous mission on the New Hebrides islands. The population is 186,000, of whom 13,000 are Presbyterians. The church has 3 presbyteries, 16 congregations, and about 2,000 communicant members, and an income of about £7,000 annually.

In 1885, a Federation of all the Australian churches was created, with an annual meeting called a Federal Assembly. This court had no legislative authority, but had mainly advisory functions, the general work of each separate provincial church being reported to it. This assembly drew the churches into close relations with one another, and tended to obliterate the differences which had so long kept them apart. The political cry of "one country" led in 1900 to the unifying of the different provinces into the "Commonwealth." This cry had been accompanied with the cry of "one church," and resulted in the changing of the advisory federation into an organic union, with a general assembly having limited powers, but within these supreme. This is, therefore, supreme in reference to the mission work on the New Hebrides, to mission work among the aborigines, to the theological training of students for the ministry, and to the receiving of ministers from other churches. All other forms of church work are reserved to the state churches, each of which retains its organization as an independent church with its annual general assembly. The Australian church has no synods, nor any courts between its presbyteries and the general assembly. This church has discussed the question of union with some of the other denominations in Australia, but as yet no decisive step has been taken in that direction.

The total population of Australia at the last census amounted to 3,773,801, of whom 455,110 reported themselves as Presbyterians. The church reports 43 presbyteries, about 500 congregations with about 60,000 communicant members.

G. D. Mathews.

VII. New Zealand: The first white man who is known to have seen these islands was Tasman, the distinguished Dutch explorer, in 1642, who gave them a name taken from his own country. After his departure they seem to have remained unvisited till 1769, when Captain James Cook took possession of them in the name of George III. Shortly afterward a number of fugitives from justice, deserters from whale ships, and others began to squat along the shores in all but constant conflict with the natives, meanwhile only deepening their degradation. Christian mission work was begun in 1814 by agents of the Church Missionary Society, who were followed in 1823 by others from the Wesleyan Methodist Church. The organized occupation of these islands by British settlers, however, did not take place till 1839, in which year three vessels left England with emigrants sent out by the New Zealand Company, which had been formed for the purpose of colonizing the northern island and trading with its people. In 1840, in which year the islands were created a British colony, another band of settlers, including the Rev. John Macfarlane, sent out by the Church of Scotland, founded Wellington, the present capital of the dominion, where a presbytery was formed in 1857 Nelson, on the extreme north of the south island, was settled in 1841 and its presbytery was formed in 1869, while in 1843 a large settlement was made at Auckland, where a presbytery was organized in 1856. Other presbyteries were soon

1. Beginnings of Presbyterianism.

nucleated, from the union of which there came, in 1862, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of New Zealand, embracing not only all the congregations and presbyteries on the north island, but five presbyteries that had been formed in the northern portion of the southern island. At some distance south of Nelson there had been made in 1850, on land previously farmed by Presbyterians from Ayrshire, a settlement consisting exclusively of members of the Church of England, to which had been given the name of Canterbury. So keen were its founders to protect its distinctive character as a Church-of-England settlement that it was proposed that no person should be allowed to reside within its limits unless he were connected with that church. The proposal failed, and Canterbury, in which a presbytery was formed in 1864, is to-day a most fruitful district for Presbyterianism, having no fewer than thirty Presbyterian congregations within its limits.

Meanwhile, probably encouraged by the favorable report of the northern settlers, the New Zealand Land Company turned its attention to Scotland, and formed in 1847 the Glasgow and Edinburgh Company, which, however, was soon merged in the Lay Association of the Church of Scotland, for the forming of a Scottish settlement in the south island.

2. Era of Settlements.

Having purchased from the natives a large tract of land to which was given the name of Otago, portions of this were sold to selected emigrants, thus laying a good foundation for the coming settlement, to the capital of which was given subsequently the name of Dun-Edin. The first of these emigrants, who as a rule were connected with the newly formed Free Church of Scotland (see I, 2, above), sailed from Glasgow in 1847, accompanied by the Rev. Thomas Burns, a nephew of Robert Burns. Band after band, generally accompanied by one or more Presbyterian ministers, quickly followed, so that in 1855 the presbytery of Otago was formed. The Company had set apart a valuable tract of land for the support of the ministers, but as the rental was yet very trifling, these adopted the principle of a sustentation fund, a system since followed throughout the church. The population of Dun-Edin was at this time perhaps as Presbyterian as that of Edinburgh itself; but in 1861 there came the discovery of the gold mines within a short distance of the city. Every man in the colony that could go left house and home for the diggings, while thousands flocked in from Australia and elsewhere, so that the quiet and settled life of the colonists was broken up. Urgent appeals to Scotland for additional ministers were willingly responded to, and in 1866 the early presbytery of Otago was divided into three others, united in the general title of the Synod of Otago and Southland. Still the supply of ministers was inadequate and in 1872 the project of a seminary was mooted for the purpose of providing a New Zealand ministry. This was fully realized in 1880 when a theological college was formally established, since which time the church has possessed a ministry largely colonial, though still occasionally aided by ministers from Great Britain. With the material advance of the country the rude buildings which had served as churches in its early days were rapidly replaced by structures that in architectural beauty, size, and costliness equal those of the mother land, the congregations themselves being hardly less large.

So soon as the presbytery of Otago was formed, in 1854, it addressed a letter to the congregations and presbyteries of the northern church, representing the importance of cooperation and union between those who had so much in common. Friendly replies were at first the only response and the matter rested for a few years. Another effort was made in 1861, and a basis for union was prepared by a joint committee. Slight differences, however, checked for the time any further progress. Both churches had a common ancestry and were agreed in doctrine, polity, and discipline, but while the northern church had always been self-supporting, that of Otago had received a considerable tract of valuable land as an endowment, the ownership of which, in view of a probable union, occasioned some concern to its ministers. Another difficulty arose from the fact that the northern brethren, owing to their dwelling amid a mixed population, were somewhat tolerant on certain matters, while those of Otago, consisting largely of men who had not only taken part in the conflicts of the Disruption but had even sought that none but members of the Scottish Free Church should be members of their community, had come to be of a more conservative temperament. A large portion of the southern church from the very beginning desired union with those of the north, but an influential minority successfully resisted all practical measures for securing that result. By degrees, however, this party softened its attitude, so that an organic union was formed between the two churches in 1901, the united church taking the name of The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of New Zealand. The synod of Otago provided that it should continue its separate existence as an independent church organization for the sake of preserving its interest in and control of the endowment it had received from the company.

3. Union of the Presbyteries.

Both these churches from an early period in their history had given great attention to church extension, and to the religious needs of the native population. Missions to the Maoris, of whom there are about 50,000 on the islands, were consequently soon formed by both. Then, as a large number of Chinese had landed in Otago during the gold discoveries and had become permanent residents, a mission was commenced by the Otago Church for their benefit. But the main mission fields of both churches are the New Hebrides islands, where a number of missionary agents are supported by each church, the church of Otago in addition supporting more than one missionary in India.

4. Missions and Statistics.

At the census in 1906 the total population of the dominion was reported to be 936,309 souls, no fewer than 203,597 of whom, or more than one-fifth of the whole population, called themselves Presbyterians. There are nearly 960 places in which

Presbyterian services are regularly held with seating-accommodation for 80,558 persons, while the average attendance is only 52,103. As organized the Presbyterian Church reports 16 presbyteries, 215 congregations, with a communicant church roll of some 32,000 persons. The difference between this figure and that of the census is largely due to the fact that the church figure represents adults, while that of the census includes children and all young people as well as a considerable number whose Presbyterianism is ancestral rather than personal. The total church contributions amount to about £120,000 a year. G. D. MATHEWS.

VIII. **In the United States and Canada.—1. The Presbyterian Church in the United States of America (Presbyterian Church North):** American Presbyterianism as a whole is as diverse in its origin as are the peoples who have blended to form the American nation. There are ten important denominational churches in the United States, designated either as Presbyterian or Reformed, which stand for Presbyterian principles. Of these, three are traceable to the influence of immigration from the continent of Europe; the Reformed (Dutch) Church and the Reformed Christian Church (qq.v.), both of which originated in Holland; and the Reformed (German) Church (q.v.) whose beginnings were in Switzerland and Germany. Four churches are directly connected with the Secession and Relief movements in the Church of Scotland during the eighteenth century (see above, I., 2), viz.: the United Presbyterian Church, the Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church in North America, Reformed Presbyterian Church in North America (General Synod), and the Associate Reformed Synod of the South (see below, 4–7). Whatever of English and Welsh Presbyterianism there was in the colonies, and in addition the few French Protestant or Huguenot churches, combined at an early day with Scotch and Scotch Irish elements to form the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. The Cumberland Presbyterian Church (see below, 3a, 3b) and the Presbyterian Church in the United States (South; see below, 2) are branches of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America; the first separating in 1810, and the second in 1861, but the first was reunited with the parent church in 1906. The youngest of the American Presbyterian Churches, the Welsh, originated in the principality of Wales (see above, IV.). These churches, however they may differ in matters of practise and worship, are substantially one in government, and all maintain the principles of the Presbyterian system as contained either in the Canons of the Synod of Dort, the Westminster Confession of Faith, or the Heidelberg Catechism. The largest and, with one exception, the oldest of the American Presbyterian churches is the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, and into it have been gathered elements from all the others. Its history, concisely stated, is as follows:

1. Sources and Varieties of American Presbyterianism.

The earliest American Presbyterian churches were established in New England, Maryland, Delaware, and Virginia, and were in large part of English origin, their pastors being Church-of-England ministers holding Presbyterian views. John Robinson (q.v.), the pastor of the Plymouth Pilgrims while in Holland, left on record the following declaration of church principles: "Touching the ecclesiastical ministry, viz., of pastors for teaching, elders for ruling, deacons for distributing the church's contributions, we do wholly and in all points agree with the French Reformed churches." The Rev. Alexander Whitaker, who held Presbyterian views, settled in Virginia in 1611, as pastor of a Puritan congregation, and in 1630 the Rev. Richard Denton located in Massachusetts with a church which he had served in Yorkshire, England. The Virginia Puritans in large part were driven out of that colony by persecution, finding refuge in Maryland and North Carolina between 1642 and 1649; and Denton and his associates found New Amsterdam more friendly than New England. The English Presbyterian element in Maryland and the colonies to the northward was strengthened by the advent, from 1670 to 1690, of a considerable number of Scotch colonists, the beginnings of a great immigration. The earliest Presbyterians in New York were the Dutch Calvinists, who founded a church in 1628; English-speaking Presbyterians were first found in New York City in 1643, with the Rev. Francis Doughty as their minister, though no Presbyterian church was organized there until 1717. Presbyterian churches of English origin, however, were established in Long Island, among which are to be noted Southold (1640) and Jamaica (1656). The founders of the earliest Presbyterian churches in New Jersey, viz., Newark (1667), Elizabeth (1668), Woodbridge (1680), and Fairfield (1680), were from Connecticut and Long Island. The first Presbyterian church in Pennsylvania was that founded by Welsh colonists at Great Valley about 1685, the church in Philadelphia dates from 1698. In 1683, the presbytery of Laggan, Ireland, in response to a letter from William Stevens, a member of the council of the colony of Maryland, sent to America the Rev. Francis Makemie (q.v.), who became the apostle of American Presbyterianism, gave himself unreservedly to the work of ecclesiastical organization, and at last succeeded in bringing into organic unity the scattered Presbyterian churches in the middle colonies.

2. Period of Isolated Churches.

The first presbytery was organized in the spring of the year 1706. The ministers of the judicatory were seven in number, representing about twenty-two congregations, not including the Presbyterians of New England, Virginia, the Carolinas, and Georgia. The place of meeting was Philadelphia, Pa., and the meeting was the first ecclesiastical gathering of an intercolonial and federal character in the country. The growth of the colonies and especially the increasing number of immigrants so added to the membership of the churches that in Sept., 1716, the general presbytery constituted itself into a synod with four presbyteries. A great number of the emigrants at this period were from Scotland and the north of Ireland, and their

3. Colonial Presbyterian Church.

settlement was productive of results of great and permanent value to the church. To the Scotch-Irish race, above all others, is American Presbyterianism indebted for its vigor, tenacity, and prosperity. The English and Scotch-Irish Presbyterians of New England, owing to local causes, were not connected ecclesiastically with those of the other colonies. There were fully 85 Presbyterian congregations in that region in 1770, and in 1775 the synod of New England was erected, composed of the presbyteries of Londonderry, Salem, and Palmer. In 1782, this synod was dissolved, and since that date until quite recently, the Presbyterian Church has had comparatively few adherents in the stronghold of the Congregationalists. The general synod in 1729 passed what is called the Adopting Act, by which it was agreed that all the ministers under its jurisdiction should declare "their agreement in and approbation of the Confession of Faith, with the Larger and Shorter Catechism of the assembly of divines at Westminster," and also "adopt the said Confession as the confession of their faith.' In the same year the synod denied to the civil magistrate power over the church, and also the power "to persecute any for their religion," and thus was first given definite ecclesiastical form to the distinctive American doctrine of the independence of the Church from control by the State. In 1745 questions of policy as to revivals and ministerial education produced a division. The "Log College," founded by William Tennent the Elder (q.v.) for the training of ministers, was one of the causes of the contention, and his son, Gilbert Tennent (q.v.), with the celebrated evangelist, George Whitefield (q.v.), were prominent in the controversy. The parties were known as "Old Side" and "New Side" (which terms are not in any manner equivalent to the terms "Old School" and "New School" in use a century later). In 1758 the divided bodies reunited upon the basis of the Westminster Standards pure and simple, and at the date of reunion the church consisted of 98 ministers, about 200 congregations, and 10,000 communicants. It was during the period of this division that the "New Side" established the institution now known as Princeton University, for the purpose of securing an educated ministry. In 1768, John Witherspoon (q.v.) was called from Scotland and installed as president of Princeton, and also as professor of divinity. This remarkable man exercised an increasing and powerful influence not only in the Presbyterian Church, but throughout the middle and southern colonies. He was one of the leading persons in the joint movement of Presbyterians and Congregationalists, from 1766 to 1775, to secure religious liberty, and to resist the establishment of the English Church as the State Church of the colonies. He was also a member of the Continental Congress, and the only clerical signer of the Declaration of Independence. Religious forces were among the most powerful influences operating to secure the separation of the colonies from Great Britain, and the opening of the Revolutionary struggle found the Presbyterian churches on the colonial side. No body of Christians has a more honorable record in the development of American institutions, or is more in sympathy with them, or has been more devoted to the cause of liberty and the rights of mankind than the Presbyterian.

With the restoration of peace in 1783, the Presbyterian Church gradually recovered from the evils wrought by war, and the need of further organization was deeply felt. The church had always been independent, having no organic connection with European and British churches of like faith. The independence of the United States had created new conditions for the Christian churches as well as for the American people. Presbyterians were no longer merely tolerated, they were entitled, equally with Episcopalians and Congregationalists, in all the states, to full civil and religious rights. In view, therefore, of these new conditions, the synod in May, 1788, adopted the Westminster Confession of Faith, with the Larger and Shorter Catechisms, and also a Form of Government, a Book of Discipline, and a Directory for Worship, as the constitution of the church. Certain changes were made in the Confession, the Catechisms, and the Directory, in the direction of liberty in worship, of freedom in prayer, and above all of liberty from control by the State. The Form of Government was altogether a new document, and established the general assembly as the governing body in the church. The first general assembly met in 1789, at Philadelphia, Pa.

4. Constitution of 1788.

The first important movement in the church after the adoption of the constitution was the formation of the "Plan of Union" with the Congregational associations of New England, which began through correspondence in 1792, and reached its consummation in the agreements made from 1801 to 1810 between the general assembly and the associations of Connecticut and other states. This Plan allowed Congregational ministers to serve Presbyterian churches, and vice versa; and also permitted the organization of mixed churches composed of members of both denominations, with the right of representation in presbytery. It remained in force until 1837, and was useful to both denominations, both in relation to the result flowing from the great revivals of religion throughout the country, and also in connection with the causes of home and foreign missions. What is known as the Cumberland separation took place during this period (see below, 3a). The presbytery of Cumberland ordained to the ministry persons who, in the judgment of the synod of Kentucky, were not qualified for the office either by learning or by sound doctrine. The controversies between the two judicatories resulted in the dissolution of the presbytery by the synod in 1806, and finally, in 1810, in the initial steps for the establishment of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church.

5. Period of the Plan of Union.

The growth of the church during the period 1790 to 1837 was very decided, the membership increasing from 18,000 to 220,557. This was due mainly to the great revival of religion which swept over the country from 1799 to 1820. Further, in this period the first theological seminary of the churches was founded at Princeton, N. J. (1811), the Boards of Home Missions (1816) and of Education (1819)

were established, and at its close the Boards of Foreign Missions (1837) and of Publication (1838) came into existence.

6. Period of Division.

About the year 1825 the peace of the church began to be disturbed by controversies respecting the Plan of Union and the establishment of denominational agencies for missionary and evangelistic work. The synod of Pittsburg as early as 1831 founded the Western Foreign Missionary Society as a distinctive denominational agency. The foreign mission work of the church had previously been conducted mainly through the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (see CONGREGATIONALISTS, I., 4, § 11), and much of the home-mission work was done through the American Education Society. The party standing for denominational agencies and opposed to the Plan of Union was known as the "Old School," and that favoring its continuance as the "New School." Questions of doctrine were also involved in the controversy, though not to so large an extent as those of denominational policy, and led to the trial for heresy of Albert Barnes (q.v.). The "Old School" majority in the assembly of 1837 brought the matters at issue to a head by abrogating the Plan of Union, by resolutions against the interdenominational societies, by the excision of the synods of Utica, Geneva, Genesee, and the Western Reserve, and by the establishment of the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions. When the assembly of 1838 met, the "New School" commissioners protested against the exclusion of the delegates from the four exscinded synods, organized an assembly of their own in the presence of the sitting assembly, and then withdrew. From 1838 onward, both branches grew slowly but steadily, and both made progress in the organization of their benevolent and missionary work. Their growth was checked, however, by disruption. The "New School" assembly of 1857 took strong ground in opposition to slavery, with the result that several southern presbyteries withdrew and organized the United Synod of the Presbyterian Church. In May, 1861, the Old School assembly met at Philadelphia, Pa., with but thirteen commissioners present from the states which had seceded from the Union. In the assembly resolutions professing loyalty to the federal government were passed by a decided majority. The minority of the assembly, however, while in favor of the federal union, were actuated by the feeling that an ecclesiastical judicatory had no right to determine questions of civil allegiance (see below, 2, § 1). These resolutions were the alleged reason for the organization of the Presbyterian Church in the Confederate States of America, which met in general assembly at Augusta, Ga., in Dec., 1861, was enlarged by union in 1863 with the United Synod above referred to, and upon the cessation of hostilities in 1865 took the name of the Presbyterian Church in the United States (see below, 2). Its membership was increased in 1869 and 1874 by the adherence of those portions of the synods of Kentucky and Missouri which protested by "declaration and testimony" against the action of the Old School assembly in the matter of the Christian character of the ministers and members of the Presbyterian Church South.

7. Period of Reunion.

The first step toward the reunion of the "Old School" and "New School" was taken in 1862, by the establishment of fraternal correspondence between the two general assemblies. A second step was the organization by the "New School" in 1863 of its own home-mission work. In 1866 committees of conference with a view to union were appointed, and Nov. 12, 1869, at Pittsburg, Pa., reunion was consummated on "the basis of the standards pure and simple." In connection with the movement, a memorial fund was raised which amounted to $7,883,983. Since the year 1870 the church has made steady progress along all lines, and its harmony was seriously threatened only by controversy (1891–94) as to the sources of authority in religion and the authority and credibility of Holy Scripture, a controversy which terminated in the adoption by the general assembly at Minneapolis, Minn., in 1899, of a unanimous deliverance affirming the loyalty of the church to its historic views on these subjects. Among the important events in the history of the church since 1870, mention is made of the following. In 1875 the general assembly entered as a leading factor into the Alliance of the Reformed Churches throughout the world holding the Presbyterian System (see ALLIANCE OF THE REFORMED CHURCHES). In 1879 the Committee on Systematic Beneficence was appointed, and in 1881 the important work of temperance reform was entrusted to the Permanent Committee on Temperance. The establishment of the Board of Aid for Colleges and Academies, in 1883, was caused by the demands of the West, and the great and growing importance of educational interests. In 1888 the centennial of the general assembly was celebrated in Philadelphia, Pa., and a centenary fund of $600,000 was raised, which was added to the endowment fund of the Board of Ministerial Relief. Correspondence between the general assemblies, north and south, was first brought about in 1882. In 1883 fraternal delegates were appointed, and appeared in the respective bodies. In 1901 the Evangelistic Committee was established, through whose efforts a decided uplift has been given to spiritual conditions, not only within the Presbyterian Church, but also among many other denominational churches. The Presbyterian Brotherhood also was organized in 1906, for evangelistic and social purposes, and includes fully 100,000 men in its membership. In 1903 the general assembly appointed a Committee on Church Cooperation and Union, as a result of whose work terms of union were framed between the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America and the Cumberland Presbyterian Church. This union was accomplished at the respective general assemblies at Des Moines, Ia., and Decatur, Ill., in 1906. There has been considerable litigation in connection with this union; but in any event the addition through it to the Presbyterian Church amounts to about 1,200 ministers, 1,800 churches, and 90,000 communicants. The church is a member of "The Council of Reformed Churches in the United States holding the Presbyterian System," established in

1907, seeking to bring into closer relations the several Presbyterian denominations in the country, and it entered heartily into the organization in Dec., 1908, at Philadelphia, Pa., of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, composed of 34 denominations, having about 18,000,000 communicants, and representing a majority of the people of the United States.

The growth of the Presbyterian Church during the nineteenth century is exhibited in the following table:

Years.	Ministers.	Churches.	Communicants.
1640	5	3	500
1690	10	18	1,000
1705	12	22	1,500
1717	19	40	3,000
1758	98	200	10,000
1789	177	431	18,000
1800	189	449	20,000
1837	2,140	2,965	220,557
1870	4,238	4,526	446,561
1880	5,044	5,489	578,671
1887	5,654	6,436	697,835
1890	6,158	6,894	775,903
1900	7,467	7,750	1,007,689
1909	9,023	9,997	1,321,386

While the population of the country has doubled about sixteen times since 1800, the membership of the church has doubled about seventy times in the same period, and the total additions on profession of faith during the century ending with 1909 appear to have been about 2,800,000. Of these there have been received since 1900, 694,341.

8. Standards.

Since 1729 the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms have been the doctrinal standards of the church, with the exception that the chapters dealing with the civil magistrate were modified in 1788 so as to conform to the American doctrine of the absolute separation of the Church from control by the State. The Confession was also amended in 1887 by the striking-out of the last clause of section 4 of chapter 24, and so removing any obstacle which may have existed to a person's marrying his deceased wife's sister. In 1903 the Confession of Faith was amended in chapters 10, 16, 22, and 25, a declaratory statement was adopted as to chapters 3 and 10, and chapters 34 and 35 were added, respectively on "The Holy Spirit" and "The Love of God and Missions." The revision accomplished in 1903 was for the expressed purpose of the disavowal of certain inferences drawn by persons outside the church as to the doctrines of the church on God's eternal decree, the love of God for all mankind, and his readiness to bestow his saving grace on all who seek it. The church also officially declared that all persons dying in infancy are included in the election of grace, and are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit, who works when and where and how he pleases. The administrative or governmental standards were adopted by the General Synod in 1788, and consist of a Form of Government, Book of Discipline, and Directory for Worship. These standards have been from time to time amended and modified, though they are still substantially as first adopted. [In 1906 *The Book of Common Worship* was adopted by the General Assembly "for voluntary use in the churches."] Prior to 1788 Steuart of Pardovan's *Collections of the Laws of the Church of Scotland* were accepted as authoritative.

9. Church Agencies.

The missionary, evangelistic, and benevolent work of the church is conducted by eight boards and two committees, the names of which, with the dates of organization, are as follows: Home Missions, 1816; Education, 1819; Foreign Missions, 1837; Publication, 1838; Church Erection, 1844; Ministerial Relief, 1855; Freedmen, 1865; Colleges, 1883. Home-mission effort was begun as early as 1719, and was carried on by the general synod and the general assembly through committees until the Board of Missions was organized in 1816. This agency had in its employ, in 1909, 1,435 missionaries, 447 missionary teachers, and expended during the year ending Mar. 31, 1909, $1,167,094. Foreign mission work was established among the American Indians (1741), Syria (1822), India (1834), Persia (1835) and also at later dates in China, Siam, West Africa, Corisco, Colombia, Brazil, Japan, Chile, Laos, Mexico, and Korea, and among the Chinese in California. In 1909 the total number of missionaries, both lay and clerical, men and women, was 946 American and 3,367 native. They were distributed in fifteen different countries, 1,781 principal stations, and 299 out-stations, having 96,801 communicants, and 101,756 Sunday-school scholars. There are in connection with the foreign work two great printing-establishments, one at Beirut, Syria, and the other at Shanghai, China. These printing-establishments in the year 1909 issued 167,834,946 pages of printed matter. There are also in connection with the various mission stations 61 hospitals, 76 dispensaries, and the number of patients treated in 1909 was 449,457 Concerning the other boards named above the following statements are made: The Board of Education stands for the fundamental principle that an educated ministry is essential to the enduring prosperity of the Christian Church. The Board of Publication and Sunday-school work emphasizes the importance of Christian nurture and of a proper Sunday-school literature. The Board of Church Erection guarantees to congregations the erection and completion of houses of worship and of manses for pastors. Since its establishment this board has aided 8,700 congregations. The Board of Relief is the church's instrument for aiding disabled and infirm ministers and the needy families of deceased ministers. This agency is the most successful of any of the agencies of a similar character in the United States. The Board of Missions for Freedmen has as its sole duty the evangelization and education of the colored people; and the College Board is the earnest effort of the church to promote and conserve Christian education in colleges and universities. There are at present fourteen theological institutions which report annually to the general assembly. The first theological instruction given by the church was through the professorship of divinity in Princeton College, now Princeton University, and the first theological professor was John Witherspoon, beginning with the year

1768. The theological seminaries were established as follows: Princeton (at Princeton, N. J.), 1812; Auburn (at Auburn, N. Y.), 1819; Western (at Allegheny, Pa.), 1827; Lane (at Cincinnati, O.), 1829; McCormick (at Chicago, Ill.), 1830; Lebanon (at Lebanon, Tenn.), 1852; Danville (at Danville, Ky.), 1853; German (at Dubuque, Ia.), 1856; Biddle (for colored students, at Charlotte, N. C.), 1868; German (Bloomfield, N. J.), 1869; San Francisco (at San Francisco, Cal.), 1871; Lincoln (for colored students at Lincoln University, Pa.), 1871. The Union Theological Seminary at Richmond, Va., established in 1824, and the Columbia Seminary, Columbia, S. C., established in 1831, have been in connection since 1861 with the Presbyterian Church. [For the data respecting Union Theological Seminary, New York City, founded 1836, see under THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES.] The statistics of the seminaries for 1909 are as follows: professors, 89; other teachers, 48; students, 709; books in the libraries, 265,476; total endowments, $10,672,142. The church reports, for 1909, 36 synods, 291 presbyteries, 9,023 ministers, 227 licentiates, 1,066 candidates for the ministry, 38,364 elders, 9,997 churches, 1,321,386 communicants, and contributions for all purposes, $21,664,756. General publications are the records of the general presbytery, 1706–16, of the general synod, 1717–88, and of the general assembly 1789–1909, each in printed form. They are the most complete ecclesiastical record in America. The *Minutes* of the general assembly and the *Reports* of the Missionary and Benevolent Boards are issued annually. The home missions of the church have been continuously upon the frontier of the advancing civilization of the American people. Its ministers and congregations have been essential factors in securing the moral and spiritual as well as the material welfare of the republic. Its influence has been decided upon the political interests of the land, for both the church and the nation are direct products of the same great reformation. The church has furnished both Revolutionary leaders, such as John Witherspoon, and also Presidents of the United States, such as Andrew Jackson, Abraham Lincoln, Benjamin Harrison, and Grover Cleveland. In heathen lands the church has exerted a quiet but mighty influence in elevating the standards of morality, in sanctifying the family relation, in introducing the element of fraternity into social relations, and above all in bringing to bear upon great masses of men and women the divine power which accompanies the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Whether at home or abroad, the church has been in all the relations in which human beings stand each to the other, and in all the aspirations of humanity, both for this world and the world to come, a savor of life unto life. W H. ROBERTS.

2. Presbyterian Church in the United States (Southern Presbyterian Church): This church roots itself in the work of Francis Makemie (q.v.; also see above, VIII., 1, §§ 2–4). In Makemie's time there began a steady immigration of Presbyterians from the north of Ireland. These immigrants, entering the port of Philadelphia, spread in great numbers southward, settling in Virginia, North Carolina, and the upper portions of South Carolina. They formed the principal element in the southern section of the church which dates from Makemie.

1. Background and Origin. Among them were some Scotch, English, and Dutch Presbyterians, and, in the lower part of South Carolina, a considerable number of Huguenots. On the division of the Presbyterian Church in 1837 (see above, VIII., 1, § 6), nearly the whole of what is now the Southern Presbyterian Church adhered to the Old School branch. This connection continued until 1861. When the Old School assembly met in Philadelphia in May, 1861, several southern states had already seceded from the Union. The majority of the assembly, thinking that the duty of patriotism demanded a profession of loyalty to the Federal government, by resolution pledged the whole constituency of the church to the support of the Federal sovereignty as against the seceded states. Charles Hodge (q.v.), for himself and fifty-seven others, protested against this action of the assembly as unconstitutional in that it assumed "to decide a political question, and to make that decision a test of membership in the church." The Presbyterians living in the South could not fulfil the pledge of loyalty to the Federal government without proving traitors to the government under which they were living at the time. The southern presbyteries and synods regarded the deliverance of the assembly as virtually an exscinding act, and at their next meetings formally renounced all connection with the Old School assembly. Commissioners from forty-seven of these presbyteries met in Augusta, Ga., Dec. 4, 1861, and organized a new assembly.

Thus the Southern Presbyterian Church began its separate existence just when the greatest civil war of history was getting well under way. During

2. Period of the War, and Accretions. the next four years the territory covered by the church was overrun by contending armies, and the church was affected by the general effects of the war in the south in the destruction of the industrial system, the impoverishment of the people, and the general demoralization of society. The work of the church was interrupted, its development retarded, and its future overshadowed. It maintained, however, in the midst of all discouragements, a vigorous life, furnishing chaplains for the army, and caring for the congregations committed to its trust. It gave constant and earnest attention to the religious instruction of the colored people, devoting to this work some of its finest pulpit talent. It was also privileged to do some effective mission work among the Indians. The growth of the church both during and immediately after the war was chiefly by the absorption of other religious bodies. The Independent Presbyterian Church, a small brotherhood in North and South Carolina, was brought into the Southern Assembly in 1863. The same year a union was effected with the United Synod of the Presbyterian Church. This synod had been organized in 1858 out of the southern contingent of the New School church as a practical protest against the deliverances of the New School Assembly on the subject of slavery. While this synod went with the New School in the division of 1837, this was not due to sympathy with

the laxity of doctrine charged against the New School body, which was the ground of division, but because the synod regarded as harsh and unconstitutional the exscinding resolutions by which that famous division was consummated. In the great upheaval of 1861–65, the synod of Kentucky adhered to the northern assembly It expressed regret, however, that the assembly had taken the action which caused the withdrawal of the southern presbyteries. This called forth a censure from the next assembly, and this inaugurated a strife which culminated in 1867 in the separation of the synod from the northern assembly. The next year commissioners from the presbyteries of Kentucky sought admission into the membership of the southern assembly and were received. The synod of Missouri went through an experience in all essential respects similar to that of Kentucky. While remaining in connection with the northern assembly during the exciting period of the war, it took exception to deliverances of the assembly touching the political condition of the country. Antagonism grew until separation resulted. For a few years the synod maintained an independent existence; but in 1874 a large part of it united with the southern assembly. The Presbytery of Patapsco in Maryland was received in 1867; the same year the Alabama presbytery of the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church, and three years later the Associate Reformed Presbytery of Kentucky were received. The absorption of these various bodies brought in about 282 ministers, 490 churches, and 35,600 communicants. As the union in every case was on the basis of perfect doctrinal affinity, there has been no resultant evil. The church stands to-day as a living organism with no scars on its body to show that any grafting has been done.

3. Evangelization; Home and Foreign Missions.

As soon as the melancholy conditions in which the church was born had passed away, and the dawn of a brighter era appeared, the church began to "lengthen its cords and strengthen its stakes." Promptly it recognized in a practical way its duty and privilege to take part in the great work of worldwide evangelization. Its first mission on foreign soil was planted in Brazil in 1869. Since that time the church has constantly enlarged its work until now, in addition to the mission in Brazil, it has missions in China, Japan, Korea, Africa, Mexico, and Cuba. The church supports a missionary force of 280, not including native workers, and has a communicant roll in its various missions aggregating more than 15,000. Its extensive work in Japan is not represented on this roll for the reason that the fruits of mission work in that country are absorbed by the native church (see JAPAN). In the year 1909, $412,156 was contributed to the support of the foreign work, an average of about $1.60 per member. There is at present a rising tide of missionary zeal sweeping over the church which promises unprecedented progress in the near future.

In the sphere of home missions, the church is manifesting a growing earnestness, and is rapidly enlarging its activities. Especially is it putting forth commendable efforts to provide for the destitution in the border states of Arkansas, Texas, and Oklahoma. The receipts for this cause for the year 1909 were much in advance of any previous year and more than three times what they were only eight years ago. As further indicating the expansion of the work, it may be noted that within the past twelve months a presbytery has been erected for the Mexicans in Texas, and a new synod was organized for Oklahoma. Home-mission work is also carried on directly by presbyteries and synods in the older sections of the church. As measured by cost of support, the work done in this way is about three times as great, but by no means three times as fruitful, as that carried on in the border territory through the assembly's executive committee. The total contributions to home missions last year were $322,288. Work for the negroes is prosecuted through an executive committee located at Birmingham, Ala. Stillman Institute, named in honor of Rev. C. A. Stillman, D.D., and designed especially, though not exclusively, for the education of colored ministers, is prospering at Tuscaloosa, Ala. The choicest fruits of this school are seen in a number of consecrated missionaries who are laboring with great success in the Congo Free State, Africa. Several Sunday-schools for colored people are conducted by white churches. Two colored presbyteries, one in Alabama and one in Mississippi, are in connection with the southern assembly.

In 1897 a number of independent colored presbyteries were organized into a synod, the name of which is the Afro-American Presbyterian Church. This synod is in a vague sense under the guardianship of the southern assembly, its ministers and churches receiving financial aid from a fund contributed for this purpose. This Afro-American Presbyterian Church is a very frail and sickly child. Its ministers are untrained and inefficient, wanting in the spirit of aggressiveness and in administrative gifts, apparently demonstrating the unwisdom of committing to the negroes an independent oversight of their own religious interests.

4. Other Agencies; Prospects.

The business of publication is conducted through a publishing-house, owned by the church, in Richmond, Va., and a book depository in Texarkana, Tex. The volume of business last year was something over $160,000, yielding a net income of $14,000. In connection with the publication work is a well-organized Sabbath-school department which furnishes a splendid literature for use in the Sabbath-schools, and also conducts a valuable mission work among the immigrant population of the larger cities, and among the long-neglected dwellers in the Appalachians. Ministerial education and relief are combined under one executive agency with headquarters at Louisville, Ky The report of this committee shows 422 candidates in course of preparation for the ministry For training its candidates, the church has five theological schools, viz., Union Seminary, Richmond, Va.; Columbia Seminary, Columbia, S. C.; the divinity department of the Southwestern Presbyterian University, Clarksville, Tenn.; the Texas Theological Seminary, Austin, Tex., and the Louisville Seminary, Louisville, Ky. This last is owned and controlled

jointly with the assembly of the northern church. A decided step has recently been taken in the work of ministerial relief. An endowment fund has been raised for this cause, amounting to $274,429, and the effort to increase this to half a million dollars gives promise of early success. In 1906, the assembly appointed an Executive Committee of Schools and Colleges. This is the practical expression of a more determined purpose to put the institutions of the church on a better financial footing, and to prosecute the work of Christian education with renewed zeal. A yet more recent development of the church's life was the creation by the assembly of 1908 of a permanent Committee of Evangelism. This was in response to an aroused and intensified interest in the direct work of reaching the unconverted. The church has expanded from 105,956 members in 1874 to 279,803; but there is a wholesome discontent with the rate of progress in the past, which prophesies a more aggressive and fruitful future.

The specific causes which led to the organization of the Southern Assembly have long since passed away. The relations between this church and that of which it once formed a part are close and fraternal, enabling them to cooperate in many forms of Christian service. There exist reasons, however, which are thought to justify a continued separation. It is believed that by independent existence the church can bear a more effective testimony to certain principles which need emphasis—such principles, for example, as strict construction in the use of creeds; the exclusively spiritual mission of the church; and the absolute authority of the Bible as being the infallible Word of God from Genesis to Revelation. In other words, the church believes that it owes a duty to doctrinal conservatism which it can best discharge by maintaining its autonomy.

R. C. Reed.

3a. Cumberland Presbyterian Church Before the Union of 1906: This church began its career as a distinct organization Feb. 10, 1810, and ceased to exist as such by an act of "union and reunion" with the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America (see above, VIII., 1) May 24, 1906. It originated in the remarkable revival of religion which in 1797 began to develop in what was then known as "the Cumberland country" in southwestern Kentucky and Tennessee, under the ministry of the Rev. James McGready (q.v.; also see Revivals of Religion).

1. Origin. The revival rapidly grew to such proportions as to create a demand for ordained ministers greater than could be supplied; the country had only recently been settled, and in those days it was far away from the sources of supply. The Cumberland presbytery ordained certain men who in respect to educational preparation fell somewhat below the requirement of the standards to which that presbytery was amenable, and this produced dissension in the synod of Kentucky, of which the Cumberland presbytery was a member, which culminated in 1806 in the dissolution of the presbytery. The synod annexed to the adjoining Transylvania presbytery the members who had not been placed under prohibition to preach the Gospel and administer its ordinances, by the committee appointed by the synod, in 1805, to take charge of the matter. The Cumberland presbytery had taken the ground in the controversy, that the proceedings of the committee appointed by the synod were unconstitutional, and, of course, that the proscribing act was unconstitutional and void. Nevertheless, from a general respect to authority, and from a desire to procure a reconciliation and enjoy peace and quietude as far as possible, both the proscribed members, and those who had promoted their induction into the ministry and sympathized with them, constituting a majority of the presbytery, organized themselves into what they called a "council," determining in this manner to carry forward the work of the revival, to keep the congregations together, but to abstain from all proper presbyterial proceedings, and await what they thought would be a redress of their grievances. This council continued its organization from Dec., 1805, to Feb., 1810. By that time the members became satisfied that they had nothing to hope, either from the synod or the general assembly. As a last resort, and in order to save what they represented to the general assembly as "a very respectable congregation in Cumberland and the Barrens of Kentucky," two of the proscribed ministers, Finis Ewing and Samuel King, assisted by Samuel McAdow, one of those who had been placed under an interdict by the commission for his participation in what they denominated the irregularities of the presbytery, reorganized the Cumberland presbytery at the house of McAdow, in Dickson County, Tenn., on Feb. 4, 1810. It was organized as an independent presbytery. It will be observed that it was a reorganization of a presbytery which had been dissolved, which had received its name from its locality. The church which grew from these beginnings naturally took the name of its first presbytery as a prefix. It grew rapidly, extending from Pennsylvania to the shores of the Pacific, and from the Great Lakes to Louisiana and Texas.

The new presbytery immediately set forth a synopsis of its theology and of the principles of action by which it proposed to be governed. Its theology was Calvinistic, with the exception of the offensive doctrine of predestination so expressed as to seem to embody the dogma of necessity or fatality. The construction which, in opposition to the letter, or form, of the Calvinistic symbols, they put upon the "idea of fatality," was: (1) that there are no eternal reprobates; (2) that Christ died, not for a part only, but for all mankind, and for all in the same sense; (3) that persons dying in infancy are saved through Christ and the sanctification of the Spirit; (4) that the Spirit of God operates on the world, as coextensively as Christ has made the atonement, in such a manner as to leave all men inexcusable. The exception of this one "idea of fatality," corresponding to these four points, must have meant and included only their antipodes: (1) eternal reprobation; (2) an atonement limited to the elect members; (3) the salvation of elect infants only; (4) the limitation of the operations of the Spirit to the elect. Aside from these points,

2. Theology and Principles.

covered by the exception, the doctrine of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, as set forth in its Confession, was, according to the opinion of its founders, identical with that of the Westminster Confession. In the year 1813 the Cumberland Presbytery had become so large that it divided itself into three presbyteries, and constituted the Cumberland Synod. This synod, at its sessions in 1816, adopted a confession of faith, catechism, and system of church order, in conformity with the principles avowed upon the organization of the first presbytery. The Confession of Faith was a slight modification and abridgment of the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church. The Larger Catechism was omitted, and also some sections of the chapter on "God's Eternal Decrees." A revised Confession was adopted in 1883.

3. Educational Institutions and Missions.

In 1826 the first college was organized and located at Princeton, Ky., under the supervision of the church. In 1842 it was transferred to Lebanon, Tenn., and the name changed to Cumberland University. It is composed of four schools—preparatory, academic, law, and theological, each school having its own corps of professors and lecturers. It is one of the oldest, and has long been one of the most prominent and useful, educational institutions in the southwest, notwithstanding the great difficulties under which it has had to struggle. There are now colleges at Waxahachie, Tex.; Lincoln, Ill.; Waynesburg, Pa.; Marshall, Mo., and Decatur, Ill., besides a number of high schools and academies under presbyterial and synodical supervision. The theological seminary in connection with Cumberland University is the only theological school. It employs seven regular professors, and the course of study extends through three years. A well-equipped publishing-house is located at Nashville, Tenn. At the time of the reunion with the Presbyterian Church the board of missions (at St. Louis) was sustaining twenty-six foreign missionaries, besides doing an extensive mission work at home. The Woman's Board of Missions was sustaining seventeen women as missionary workers in foreign countries.

4. The Union of 1906.

The revision of its Confession of Faith by the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America (1903) immediately gave rise to the question of union between that Church and the Cumberland Presbyterian. The explanatory statements and new chapters added to the Confession, and thus incorporated into the constitution of the church, were regarded as an official repudiation by the highest authority of the one-sided and fatalistic interpretations to which the Confession had hitherto been exposed. Accordingly, after prolonged and thorough canvass, of the question before the presbyteries and the assemblies, the "union and reunion" of the two churches, formally declared to be "alike honorable to both," was consummated by the two assemblies in May, 1906. The doctrinal and ecclesiastical standards of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A. (1903) are the bases of the union. At that time the Cumberland Presbyterian Church was composed of 114 presbyteries, aggregating about 200,000 members and about 1,600 ordained ministers, the value of the church property being estimated at about seven millions of dollars.

ROBERT VERRELL FOSTER.

3b. Cumberland Presbyterian Church Since the Union of 1906: The original Cumberland Presbyterian Church (see above, 3a) maintained its integrity unimpaired through the Civil War, and received its first rude shock from passions engendered by the movement for union with the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America which began in 1903 and culminated in May, 1906. A large number of the prominent members and a majority of the ministers went into the other church. Something like half the membership remained, scattered over the territory formerly occupied by the whole church. Many congregations divided, and this left the working efficiency of the church much impaired. Since the union those remaining have gone on as before, holding the same creed and the same polity as before, looking to the same literature as the authoritative exposition of their creed, polity, and aspirations, and holding a theology midway between that of St. Augustine and that of Pelagius, between the systems of Calvin and Arminius. Thus, while Calvinism declares that salvation is unconditional to sinners, certain to saints, and impossible to some, and Arminianism holds that salvation is conditional to sinners, uncertain to saints, possible to all, and certain to none, the Cumberland church believes that salvation is conditional to sinners, certain to saints, possible to all, and certain to every one truly converted. Similarly Calvinism teaches that election is unconditional and dates from eternity; Arminianism, that no election is certain in this life; the Cumberland church teaches that election takes place when man is regenerated on complying with the terms of the Gospel. Further, Calvinism teaches that every man's destiny was fixed before the world began; Arminianism, that no man's destiny is fixed, but that it remains uncertain in this life; the Cumberland church, that every man's destiny is uncertain until he is regenerated, when it becomes fixed and certain.

The *Minutes* of the general assembly of 1909 reports: 90,000 communicants, 614 ministers, 81 candidates, 72 licentiates, 1,884 congregations, 97 presbyteries, 17 synods, congregational church property to the value of $4,000,000, much of it now in litigation. Several state supreme courts have held the union (with the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America) legal and that the property of local congregations passed into the union, while other like judicatories have held the union illegal and that the property remained with the Cumberland Presbyterian Church. The publishing-house at Nashville, Tenn., is yet in litigation. There is one school at McKenzie, Tenn. Home-mission work is maintained, but foreign mission work is hampered by lack of funds.

FINIS HOMER PRENDERGAST.

4. Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America. The Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America is the lineal representative of the Church of Scotland, holding forth the same principles that were exhibited during the Sec-

ond Reformation (1638–49), the purest period in its history. It is also known as the Covenanter Church, because of its adherence to the principles embodied in the National Covenant of Scotland, and the Solemn League and Covenant (see COVENANTERS, §§ 3–4). In 1661 the State demanded an unqualified oath of allegiance, and all who subscribed the covenants were dealt with as guilty of treason from that date until the Revolution Settlement in 1688 (see above, I., 1, § 3). A church that had never been identified with the State Church and had never come out of the church of Rome, its members being loyal to the truth as it is in Jesus during the papal ascendency in Europe, was subjected to loss of property and its members were compelled to endure imprisonment and death merely because of loyalty to the crown of Christ. Owing to the defection of some of its ministers in 1691 (see CAMERON, RICHARD, CAMERONIANS), the Covenanter Church was without any pastoral oversight for sixteen years, and the truth was kept alive in the hearts of its members by means of social gatherings for Christian conference and prayer, while the members refused to wait on the ministry of any who had been false to their ordination vows. In 1706 John Macmillan, a Presbyterian minister who had been deposed by the general assembly of the State Church for the advocacy of covenant obligations, accepted the principles of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, and for more than thirty years was its only ordained minister, visiting the societies and preaching to them a complete Christ, and with the assistance of a licentiate who had been silenced by the State Church for his loyalty to Reformation truth, held them together. In the spring of 1743 Thomas Nairn, of the Associate Presbytery, a secession from the State Church, joined the Covenanters, and on Aug. 1 of that year he and John Macmillan constituted the Reformed Presbytery at Braehead, Scotland.

The persecution in Scotland led many to seek refuge in the American colonies, and in many localities societies were formed on the basis of Reformation principles. On Mar. 10, 1774, the first Reformed presbytery in America was constituted at Paxtang, Pa. Its ministerial members were Matthew Linn and Alexander Dobbin, who had been sent from Ireland the previous year, and John Cuthbertson, who came from Scotland in 1751 and had been laboring alone for twenty-two years. During the confusion and excitement of the revolutionary war the views of many became unsettled, with the result that in 1782 a union was formed with the Associate Church. In response to an appeal from scattered societies that had not gone into that union, James Reid was appointed by the Reformed Presbytery of Scotland in 1789 to inquire into their condition, and on his report two ministers were sent out in 1791 and 1792, who were afterward directed to act as a committee of the home presbytery in the adjustment of all judicial matters. Soon others arrived, and in May, 1798, William King and James McKinney, already on the ground, and William Gibson, who had come out in 1797, with ruling elders, constituted the second Reformed Presbytery of America at Philadelphia, Pa. And at the same place, on May 24, 1809, was constituted the Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of America.

Nothing occurred to disturb the peace of this church till 1832, when one of its leading ministers began to advocate views that were subversive of its distinctive principles. The result was a division in 1833, in which a minority of its ministers and about half of its members abandoned the historic position of the Church (see below, 7). Since then the synod has enjoyed a good measure of prosperity, and at present is aggressive in its missionary operations and in the influence for good that its reform work is exerting. It reports for 1909, 10 presbyteries, 137 ministers, 114 congregations, 9,503 communicants, and $213,772 in contributions for all purposes at home and abroad.

The Reformed Presbyterian Church is not an offshoot from any other ecclesiastical organization, but part of the stem of the original Church of Scotland. Its distinctive testimony turns on the supreme headship of Jesus Christ: It holds that he is exclusive head of the Church, deciding as to manner of worship, so that its congregations use only Bible Psalms, and no instrumental music in the service of song, on the principle that what he has not required is forbidden, and also as to form of government, which in all its leading principles is Presbyterian—not leaving to human device matters so essential to the efficiency of the Gospel ministry and the edification of his people. It also holds that he is the head of the State, and that every nation, not only in its individual citizenship, but in its corporate capacity, owes worship to God and this worship can be rendered only through his mediation, so that its members refuse to swear allegiance to any civil constitution that fails to honor him as head of the Church and prince of the kings of the earth, and believe that it is the duty of all Christians to have no dealings with the political body that might be interpreted as an approval of national disloyalty to the mediatorial king.

ROBERT MACGOWAN SOMMERVILLE.

5. Associate Reformed Synod of the South: In a sense the Associate Reformed Church may be said to have its origin in Scotland in 1733 at Gairney Bridge when Ebenezer Erskine (q.v.), William Wilson, Alex Moncrieff, and James Fisher left the Established Church of Scotland and formed the Associate Presbytery (see above, I., 1, § 4, 2, § 2). The more immediate ancestors of the church came from Scotland and the north of Ireland and settled in New York, Pennsylvania, and the Carolinas. Their first organization in the United States was the Associate Presbytery of Pennsylvania in 1753. In 1774 the Reformed Presbyterians organized a Reformed Presbytery and in 1782 these were united into the Associate Reformed Synod. This organization grew rapidly and by 1803 there were four synods, those of New York, Pennsylvania, Scioto, and the Carolinas. The last was organized at Ebenezer or Brick Church, Fairfield Co., S. C., May 9, 1803, there being present at the organization seven ministers, two probationers, and six ruling elders.

In 1822 this synod withdrew from the Associate Reformed Church, became independent, and as-

sumed its present name. This withdrawal came about not because of slavery nor sectionalism but because of the great distance and also on account of some difference of opinion on the questions of psalmody and close communion.

The church reports 9 presbyteries, 125 ministers, 158 congregations, and nearly 15,000 members, who give annually over $100,000. The congregations are scattered from Virginia to Texas and mission work is done in Mexico and India.

This church stands for the whole body of truth held by most branches of the Presbyterian Church: for the acceptance of and adherence to the Westminster standards, for the Calvinistic system of theology, for the fundamental principles of this theology, beginning with the sovereignty of God and embracing the remaining four points logically springing therefrom unto the assured salvation of the elect, for the government of the Church by pastors and elders having authority to act for Jesus Christ, the king and head of the Church, for the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures, and for the sole, supreme, and infallible authority of the Bible for all rules of conduct and duty. It confines itself to the exclusive use of the inspired songs of the Bible in God's worship, the Book of Psalms having been set to music, the last being the distinctive difference between Associate Reformed Presbyterians and the Presbyterian Church South.

This church demands an educated ministry, and encourages education among its members. Its theological seminary is located at Due West, S. C., and has a good faculty and a large endowment, and has done good work in training the ministers of the denomination. Erskine College, also located at Due West, was founded in 1839, was the first denominational college in the state, and is one of the leading colleges in the state to-day. The Due West Female College has a splendid equipment and is doing a good work for the women of the church. *The Associate Reformed Presbyterian* is the official organ of the synod. W. K. DOUGLAS.

6. United Presbyterian Church of North America. This church gathers into itself several branches of the Scottish dissenting churches, one of which was the Associate Presbyterian Church, founded by a secession from the National Church of Scotland led by Ebenezer Erskine (q.v.) in which he was joined by three other ministers (see above, I., 1, § 4, 2, § 2). Another was the Reformed Presbyterian Church (see COVENANTERS; also see above, I., 5, and VIII., 4–5). In 1706 Rev. John Macmillan became the minister, and thirty-seven years later a minister named McNair joined him, and these two organized a presbytery, and thus originated the Reformed Presbyterian Church. From these two churches descended a number of churches in America. Many of the persecuted Presbyterians who fled from Scotland and had taken refuge in Ireland were in the stream of immigrants that flowed into America in the early part of the eighteenth century. The Reformed Presbyterians among these sent for the Rev. John Cuthbertson as minister, who came from the newly formed presbytery of Scotland. The territory over which he extended his paternal rather than pastoral care (he seems never to have been installed) comprised nearly all of southeastern Pennsylvania. In the same current that carried these Scotch and Scotch-Irish in such large numbers to America were many who were affiliated with the Associate Church of Scotland. So these two churches lived and thrived in American soil, both of them perpetuating distinctions which belonged to the country, in its government, from which they came. The members of these two churches were of the same blood, their dissent from the national Church of Scotland had been for substantially the same reason—dissatisfaction with the power of the State over the Church, and the increasing laxity of doctrine in the national Church. Now they were in the same territory and held the same standards of doctrine and government, so the two churches became one in 1782, the new church combining the names of the two churches and becoming known as the Associate Reformed Church. Every minister of the Reformed Church came into the union, but a few of the congregations refused to come. These congregations sent to Scotland for ministers and the church continued (see above, VIII., 4), while some of the congregations of the Associate Church followed their example. Thus a third church was in the field.

1. Origins in Scotland and America.

The new Associate Reformed Church had considerable strength and was scattered over a territory embracing Pennsylvania, New York, New England, and Ohio. It grew rapidly and soon had congregations in many of the states. It was divided into four synods with a general synod meeting annually. The distances were so great and the means of travel so poor, that brethren could not attend, and the power was in the hands of a few; consequently dissatisfaction arose, resulting in divisions and the constituting of independent tribunals. One of these was called the Associate Reformed Synod of the West, another the Associate Reformed Synod of the South (see above, VIII., 5). The former united with the General Synod in 1855. The territory of the church extended to the Mississippi River. This consolidated church together with the resuscitated Associate Church held a common doctrine and occupied the same field. There was general desire for union, especially among the laity; for some time union was obstructed on theological grounds, but finally, in May, 1858, in Pittsburg, Pa., where both general synods were in session, the union was formed amid great enthusiasm, rejoicing, and thanksgiving, the new church taking the title of the United Presbyterian Church of North America. The church had early recognized the need of ministers of the Gospel to preach in this great home-mission territory. Both branches had founded theological schools. The Associate Seminary, established at Service, Pa., in 1794, is the oldest in continuous service in America, and is now located at Xenia, Ohio. The church also has a flourishing theological seminary in Pittsburg, Pa., it has several high-grade colleges and many academies, and has always been zealous in the cause of Christian education. Its standards are the Westminster Confession of Faith and Cate-

2. Formation, Work, and Statistics.

chism and a Declaration of Testimony. It adheres to the exclusive use of the Psalms in the praise service of the congregations. It early discarded the old Scottish versions and prepared its own version, frequently revising it until now it has a version that clearly brings out the ideas of the old Hebrew figures, and is one of great poetical beauty and literary smoothness. The ban on instrumental accompaniment was long ago removed and pipe-organs and other instruments of music are now in general use. It reports 1,098 ministers, 69 licentiates, 98 students of theology, 4,314 ruling elders, 1,082 congregations, and 153,956 communicants, who contribute annually $2,441,587, an average per member of $18.64.

3. Its Agencies.

Its work is carried on through the agency of seven chartered boards: (1) the Board of Foreign Missions, Philadelphia. The foreign missionary work is now concentrated in three great missions, India, Egypt, and the Sudan. Since 1843 there have been sent out 292 missionaries to foreign lands. The annual outlay is about $250,000. (2) The Board of Home Missions, Pittsburg, Pa., which gives aid to churches and establishes missions in nearly every state, except a few of the states in the South. The Associate Reformed Church's work in Texas has recently been turned over to the United Presbyterian Church. This board spends about $150,000 per year. It has recently undertaken foreign missionary work on American soil. (3) The Board of Freedmen's Mission, Pittsburg, Pa., carries on an extensive work with its schools and colleges and mission stations among the freedmen of the South, at an expenditure of about $80,000 annually. (4) The Board of Church Extension, Pittsburg, Pa., erects church-buildings in the new missions established by the Board of Home Missions. Its annual gifts approximate $75,000. (5) The Board of Publication, Pittsburg, Pa., occupies its own large publication house and office-buildings, and from its quarters a stream of Sabbath-school helps, Psalters, Bible songs, anthem books, and other publications is constantly flowing. (6) The Board of Ministerial Relief, Philadelphia, cares for the aged and infirm ministers or their widows or orphans, distributing more than $16,000 annually. (7) The Board of Education, Monmouth, Ill., has all of the colleges and academic schools under its care, and is doing a large work in the interest of Christian education in the denominational schools. In addition to these seven boards there is also a Women's Board which acts as an auxiliary to all the other boards. It receives and distributes annually about $100,000.

Such is the United Presbyterian Church in its origin and history and work. It steadily holds its place as a part of the visible body of Christ, sustains the most friendly relation to the other Evangelical churches, and, heartily and enthusiastically entering into the Federation of the Churches of Christ in America, holds itself ready to cooperate to the full extent of its ability in any way that will advance the Master's kingdom.

J. C. Scoulleр.

7. Reformed Presbyterian Church in North America (General Synod): The origins of this church in Scotland are told in the article Covenanters, and above in I., 1, 2, 5, 6, cf. VIII., 4, 5. Its immediate derivation was from the Reformed Presbyterian Church in Scotland (see above, I., 5), through which body the Reformed Presbyterian Churches of Ireland and America have received their ministry. The Reformed Presbytery adopted as its constitution the doctrinal standards and polity of the church during the period of the Second Reformation. From this it will be seen that the designation Reformed Presbyterian is rooted in and grows out of ecclesiastical dissent and not from any attempt to reform Presbyterianism, either in the Old World or the New.

The Reformed Presbyterian Church began its existence in America in 1774, through the organization of a presbytery in that year by the Rev. John Cuthbertson, William Lind, and Alexander Dobbin. Through an abortive attempt to unite this presbytery with that of the Associate Church, in 1782, the church was disorganized for a number of years. In 1798, the presbytery was reconstituted by the Rev. James McKinney and William Gibson, and in 1709 two other presbyteries were formed, and the three were organized into a synod. In 1823, it was thought desirable to give the supreme judicatory a representative character, and the general synod was formed.

About this time a lively discussion began concerning the relation of the church to the civil government of the United States. Some held that the constitution was infidel and immoral, and that the members of the church could not be true to their covenant engagements and take part in the government. Others held that while the constitution was defective in not formally recognizing the headship of Jesus Christ, that it was not essentially infidel and immoral, and that therefore Reformed Presbyterians would violate no oaths in exercising the right of franchise. In the synod of 1831, the question of civil relations was made a subject of "free discussion." But in 1833 those who took the extreme position of dissent withdrew, forming what is known as the Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church (see above, VIII., 4), as distinct from the General Synod.

The doctrinal position of the church is stated in the Westminster standards. The church has always declared in favor of simplicity of worship, adhering to the exclusive use of the Psalms as the medium of praise. Quite a number of ministers and congregations left the denomination about 1870 as a result of the discussion of this question. The church has recently become depleted as a result of the reaction against the conservatism of the church in refusing instrumental aid in divine worship. In 1905, however, conditional permission was granted to use instrumental music in the churches. The church carries on foreign mission work in India, and sustains mission stations in various parts of the United States. A flourishing college is maintained at Cedarville, Ohio, and a theological seminary in Philadelphia, Pa. There are at present 19 ministers and 20 congregations with a membership approximating 3,000, and 2 congregations in Canada, with a membership of 400, sup-

porting two missionaries, one at Hoorkee, India, and one at Teeswater, Canada. C. A. YOUNG.

8. Calvinistic Methodist Church (Welsh Presbyterian Church in America): The Welsh emigrants who came to this country first settled in Merion, Radnor, and Haverford Counties, Pennsylvania, a few years before 1700. They bought 5,000 acres of land from William Penn. Most of them were Quakers, though Episcopalians and Baptists were found among them. In the year 1707 a petition was sent to the bishop of London for a rector who could preach in Welsh. A Welsh Baptist church was organized in the Great Valley, Pa., in 1711 by Rev. Hugh Davis, and in 1796 another in Ebensburg, Pa. In the years 1775–1825 many Welsh churches were organized in New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania. These were Congregational in polity for two reasons: (1) the majority of the ministers were Congregationalists, (2) that form of church government seemed to be better adapted to the conditions occasioned by the fact that the members belonged to different denominations in Wales. Soon the churches began to feel the need of closer fellowship with one another and were ready for associations in which a number of churches could unite in Christian fellowship and service. These associations were held for several years by the churches in the three states named. In 1805 a Welsh church was organized in Steuben, Oneida County, New York, as a union church with the Congregational form of government. This church, together with the other Welsh churches in Ohio and Pennsylvania, increased numerically by the arrival of Welsh immigrants, who brought with them the doctrinal controversies that stirred Wales in the first half of the last century. The result was that members who were Calvinistic in their theology gradually withdrew from the independent churches and organized churches of their own by adopting the Confession of Faith and the Book of Discipline of the Methodist Calvinistic Church of Wales. The first Welsh Presbyterian church in America was organized at Pen-y-Cærau, Remsen, New York, in 1826, and this was followed in the years 1828–34 by the organization of thirty-six others in Pennsylvania, Ohio, and New York, and the church extended later into Wisconsin. In this way was laid the foundation of the Welsh Presbyterian Church in America.

1. Founding of Churches.

During this formative period the leaders saw the need of creating presbyteries and synods, but this was found almost impracticable on account of distance, expense, and mode of travel. They succeeded, however, in forming one synod, comprising all the Welsh Presbyterian churches in the states of New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania. Each church had the privilege of sending one or more delegates to this synod as it convened from time to time in the different states. Later the synod was divided into two; the one comprising all the Welsh Presbyterian churches in the states of New York and Pennsylvania; the other comprising the churches at Pittsburg and in the West. In a few years presbyteries were formed within these synods.

2. Organization of Presbyteries, Synods, and General Assembly.

The Synod of New York was formed at Pen-y-Cærau, N. Y., May 10, 1828, and was the first held in America; the Synod of Ohio was formed at Cincinnati June 12, 1833; the Synod of Pennsylvania, at Pottsville Apr. 5, 1845; the Synod of Wisconsin, at Waukesha Dec. 31, 1843; the Western Synod, at Bush Creek, Mo., in Oct., 1882; the Synod of Minnesota, at Sion (near Mankato) in 1858. The Welsh Presbyterian Church in America organized its general assembly at Columbus, Ohio, Sept. 22, 1869. This body is composed of two ordained ministers and two elders from each synod, together with the ex-moderators, clerks of synods, the statistician, the treasurer, and the chairman, secretary, and treasurer of the board of missions; the editor of the denominational organ, *The Friend*, and those appointed to read papers in the assembly. The purpose of the assembly is to deliberate upon the subjects that have to do with the welfare of the denomination in America.

The church reports for 1909, 147 churches (organizations), 95 ministers, 13,695 communicants, 11,465 Sunday-school members, and contributions to the amount of $136,348.

The Welsh Presbyterian Church in America cordially agrees with the Presbyterians of the "Old School" and with the Dutch Reformed of this country. The Confession of Faith harmonizes minutely with the Westminster Catechism. The form of church government is considered Presbyterian; but, strictly, the polity of the church partakes partly of the Congregational order as well as of the Presbyterian. The session of a Welsh Presbyterian church has less power than the session of a Presbyterian church. The local church receives and dismisses members, and exercises discipline; if it is not able to reach a decision in any case of discipline, an appeal may be made to the presbytery. The church discipline is contained in thirty-nine rules, published in connection with an outline of their history and with the Confession of Faith. All the services are very simple. R. T. ROBERTS.

3. Doctrine, Polity, and Worship.

9. Cumberland Presbyterian Church, Colored: As the Cumberland Presbyterian Church (see 3a above) began to extend in what was, 100 years ago, the far southwest, it developed a colored constituency which became an integral part of its membership. In every truly Christian family the personal relation between master and slave was close and appreciation was mutual. The slave was recognized not merely as a chattel, but as a man and an immortal. Hence religious instruction was provided and personal religious influence was exercised, with a view to the negro's conversion and salvation. Family worship was common in those days and the servants from the near-by cabins who could conveniently come joined the family-gathering at morning and evening worship. Those prepared for church-membership gladly became members of "Old master's church." They were accorded the full enjoyment of the sacraments and other privileges of the church, worshiping in the same house at the same hour, with the same pastor, or, if the

colored constituency was sufficiently numerous, the pastor sometimes gave them a special service. The type of Christian negro this process produced was the "good negro" of ante-bellum days, possessed of a strong Christian character and intensely devoted to his church. These characteristics still appear in some degree among the second and third generations. Out of such material the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, Colored, was formed. A few men among them had been ordained to the ministry. They constituted a presbytery to themselves and sought representation in the general assembly of 1870. This was denied and complete separation was the result, the whites advising it and the blacks accepting it as inevitable and as probably best for their race.

In entering upon this separate and independent ecclesiastical existence they had nothing except their own simple childlike faith and their ardent evangelistic spirit; they did not then receive and have never had any substantial backing from any board or benevolent fund. The White Cumberland Presbyterians had lost almost everything by the war and their struggle to rebuild was severe. Engaged in strictly mission work, they could render but little missionary service to their brethren in black. Without money, without schools, and without a trained leadership, this young negro denomination proceeded with its revival methods, making much of its "'whosoever will' Gospel," boasting of its doctrine of divine sovereignty and final perseverance, and particularly appreciative of the spirit of liberty which was seen in the Presbyterian form of government. The efforts of individual congregations have been supported by the liberal assistance of their white friends in the locality. Hence they are reasonably well provided with houses of worship. They have also had some assistance in their schools, but for education, even of the ministry, their chief reliance has been the common schools provided by the State. At Bowling Green, Ky., they have a well-conducted academy which gives training in the Bible and kindred subjects and provides special training for preachers and teachers. Since the union of the Cumberland Church with the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America (see above, 3a), the latter denomination is giving systematic assistance in educational work.

Conservatively estimated, the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, Colored, has a membership of 25,000, located principally in Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Texas, and southeast Missouri. They have probably 200 churches, 160 ministers, and 150 Sabbath-schools, with an enrolment of about 8,000. Their school property amounts to about $20,000 and their church property to about $100,000. They are organized into 18 presbyteries, 5 synods and a general assembly, and they have at least the beginnings of the customary church machinery, such as boards of education, missions, and ministerial relief. The field they occupy is quite distinct from that of the negroes of other Presbyterian denominations. It is large and inviting and is capable of practically unlimited development. Under a trained leadership in pulpit and school, and with ample facilities for handling its general work, this independent Presbyterian denomination is capable of becoming an important factor in the uplift of the negro race. W. J. Darby.

10. Reformed Presbyterian Church (Covenanted): A presbytery under this name was organized in 1840 by two ministers and three elders, who withdrew from the Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church on the ground that it "fellowshiped and indorsed voluntary and irresponsible associations of the day, composed of persons of all religious professions or of no profession; and that its ministers were chargeable with sins of omission and commission in their ecclesiastical relations; and that they refuse to confess and forsake these sins." The presbytery met with varying fortunes, being disorganized in 1845, reorganized in 1853, and disorganized in 1887 In 1883 it contained 4 ministers and 6 organizations in four states, but has since diminished, until at the time of the census of 1906 there was but one small society at North Union, Pa., with 17 members worshiping in a hall and having one elder and a theological student as minister.

Edwin Munsell Bliss.

11. Reformed Presbyterian Church in the United States and Canada: This body was organized in 1883 in consequence of dissatisfaction with the treatment of a question of discipline by the General Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church. It holds with the General Synod that the republic of the United States is essentially Christian, and that Christian citizens may vote and be voted for. According to the census of 1906 it had but one organization in the United States in Alleghany Co., Pa., owning one church edifice valued at $200,000, and reporting 440 communicant members. It contributed to missionary work in India the sum of $325 in 1906, and maintains a Syrian missionary among the Syrians of this country at an annual expenditure of over $500.

Edwin Munsell Bliss.

12. The Presbyterian Church in Canada: There is now but one Presbyterian Church in the Dominion of Canada, comprising eight synods and sixty-seven presbyteries. Before it became one it passed through many changes.

1. Origins.

France first owned the Canadian territory on the Atlantic seaboard, and the first settlers were largely Roman Catholic (see Canada). By the Treaty of Utrecht in 1713 Nova Scotia came into the possession of Great Britain, and was later divided into Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. In the ceded territory, the inhabitants, being Roman Catholic, remained loyal to France. Great Britain sought to change the political complexion of the country by bringing in Protestant colonists. The Acadians of Nova Scotia refused to be assimilated by this means, and finally, in 1755, were forcibly deported into the English colonies to the south, now the United States. Settlers were invited to take possession of the lands and homes thus vacated, liberty of conscience being guaranteed. Those who flocked in from Britain were largely Protestants, and many of them were Presbyterians. The Presbyterian settlers naturally applied to the countries from which they came to send them ministers. Rev. James Lyon came in 1764 from New

Jersey, while Rev. James Murdoch, who came from Scotland in 1766, was the first permanent Presbyterian minister in Nova Scotia. Some of the Protestants who came from Europe belonged to the Reformed Church, and these persuaded Messrs. Lyon and Murdoch in 1770 to ordain a Mr. Comingoe, a fisherman of ability, piety, and influence, to be their pastor. This was the first ordination and the first meeting of presbytery held in the land. The many divisions of the Presbyterian Church in Scotland were maintained in the new country by the immigrants, who clung to their old affiliations. As Presbyterian congregations grew in numbers, new presbyteries were formed. The Burgher presbytery of Truro was organized in 1786, the Anti-Burgher presbytery of Pictou in 1795. In July, 1817, these two bodies united to form the Presbyterian Church of Nova Scotia, comprising three presbyteries. The Presbyterians in that year numbered about 42,000, with twenty-six ministers.

2. Under British Rule.

After the capture of Quebec in 1759 and the surrender of Montreal in 1760, Rev. George Henry became the first Presbyterian minister of Quebec in 1765, and Rev. John Bethune of Montreal in 1786. Presbyterian settlers pushed in farther and farther west. The first systematic efforts to send Presbyterian ministers to Upper Canada were made by the Reformed (Dutch) Church of the United States. Rev. Robert McDowall in 1798 crossed the St. Lawrence, and organized congregations from Brockville to Toronto, and the Rev. Daniel W. Eastman itinerated in the Niagara Peninsula from 1801. In 1818 a number of Presbyterian ministers issued a general invitation to the Presbyterian ministers west of Quebec to meet on July 9, 1818, with the view of forming "The Presbytery of the Canadas" independent of the old lines of division in Scotland. They met and organized what was the first presbytery in Upper or Lower Canada, with five ministers on their roll. The Presbyterian population in Upper Canada was then about 47,000, ministered to by sixteen ministers. The Earl of Selkirk brought out a colony of Highlanders from Scotland to settle along the Red River, in what is now Manitoba, which he had purchased for the purpose in 1810, though it was not till 1817 that they were allowed peaceable possession; the Earl of Selkirk also gave sites for a church and school at Kildonan, but it was 1851 before they had a minister of their own. The difficulty from the beginning was to secure a sufficient number of suitable ministers to supply Gospel ordinances to Presbyterians. Scotland felt the burden of responsibility, and in 1825 the Glasgow Colonial Society was formed, which sent out within ten years over forty men (all ministers of the Established Church of Scotland), and gave a small grant to each to aid in his support. Others who came helped to perpetuate the differences of the mother country. While a spirit of separation existed, there was at the same time a strong feeling in all denominations that there was no good reason for perpetuating the differences of the old land in the new. But the leaven of union worked very slowly.

In Upper Canada, in 1831, nineteen Presbyterian ministers from various sections met in Kingston and united to form the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of Canada in Connection with the Church of Scotland. In the same year the Presbytery of the Canadas, which was now called the United Presbytery, changed its name once more to the United Synod of Upper Canada. This synod united with the synod in connection with the Church of Scotland, and the name The Synod of the Presbyterian Church in Canada in Connection with the Church of Scotland was retained. On its roll were seventy-seven ministers. The Disruption in Scotland affected the Presbyterians in the Maritime Provinces and Western Canada, and resulted in a Free Church in Nova Scotia, which, in 1860, united with the Presbyterian Synod of Nova Scotia, to form the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of the Lower Provinces, with eighty-two ministers. In Western Canada, in 1861, the United Presbyterian Synod, of fifty-nine ministers, united with the Synod of the (Free) Presbyterian Church of 129 ministers, to form The Canada Presbyterian Church. In 1866 the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of the Lower Provinces united with the Free Presbyterian Synod of New Brunswick to form the Synod of the Lower Provinces, with 113 ministers. In 1868 the Synods of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick in the Maritime Provinces, in connection with the Church of Scotland, united to form the Synod of the Presbyterian Church of the Maritime Provinces of British North America in connection with the Church of Scotland, composed of thirty-three ministers. These several unions resulted in there being four denominations of Presbyterians in 1870 in Canada, two in the Maritime Provinces, and two in western Canada. Leaders in all sections saw the necessity of union. Congregations were weak through division, and barely able to support their pastors. Negotiations were opened in 1870, and a union was effected in 1875, and The Presbyterian Church in Canada was formed with 627 ministers, 706 congregations, 88,228 members, 176 missionaries in the home field and 16 in the foreign, with a revenue of nearly one million dollars for all purposes. Only a few ministers and congregations then refused to enter, and one by one they, too, have come in, till at the present time those still holding aloof can almost be counted on the fingers of one hand.

3. Period of Unions.

Since the union of 1875 the problem of keeping pace with the immigrants coming into the country has become yearly more difficult. For the past two or three years Canada has added about four per cent annually to her population by immigration. To give Gospel ordinances to these newcomers, so that no section of the country shall be left spiritually desert, has taxed the energies of all denominations of Christians. The Presbyterian Church, striving to help all who have called, finds its task complicated by the large foreign element appealing for public-school teachers as well as missionaries. The work of home missions may be considered in three sections: (1) Home missions proper are carried on by two committees, one for the Maritime Provinces, and one for western

4. Church Agencies.

Canada. In the two sections 668 missionaries are employed, of whom 205 are ordained. The others are students preparing for the ministry, or catechists. They minister to 1,787 mission stations. The amount expended for this work during 1908 was about $210,000. All the colleges have missionary societies which furnish men and money to aid in home-mission work. (2) Augmentation: This scheme has for its object the granting of aid in settled congregations to make the minister's salary at least $800 and a manse. This required, in 1908, nearly $50,000 to supplement the salaries of 204 ministers. A separate committee has this work in charge. (3) French evangelization: The Presbyterian Church has always taken a deep interest in assisting the small numbers of its people scattered among the Roman Catholic population in Quebec, and in keeping up an aggressive work by means of teachers and colporteurs, scattering literature and copies of the Scriptures among French Canadians. The school at Pointe-aux-Trembles has been a most effective institution in cultivating a liberal and enlightened spirit among the people. The cost of the French work in 1908 was $42,500, and the work is under the management of a board. In higher education generally Presbyterians have given a percentage of teachers to the country considerably in excess of their numerical strength. In every great educational and university center this church has established a theological college, and has colleges in Halifax, Montreal, Kingston, Toronto, Winnipeg, and Vancouver. In 1908 there were in these colleges 208 students taking the theological course. The maintenance of the colleges in 1908 cost nearly $40,000. The foreign mission work of the church is in the hands of one committee. Work is carried on in Japan, Korea, China, India, the New Hebrides, West Indies, South America, among the Indians and Chinese of the Northwest, and the Jews. In 1908 the number of missionaries, foreign and native, was 668, at a cost of $236,000. Active Women's Societies give substantial aid to both Home Mission and Foreign Mission Committees of the Church. Aged Ministers and Ministers' Widows' and Orphans' Funds are maintained which give annuities to aged ministers according to length of service, $400 being the limit of annuity, and to widows an annuity of $150, with an allowance for each child under eighteen. The church reported for 1908 1,690 ministers, 9,167 elders, 2,192 congregations, 1,787 mission stations, 269,688 communicants, and 210,248 Sabbath-school scholars. During the same year it paid for stipends, $1,344,648; for missions, $690,000; by women's societies, $142,250; for all purposes, $3,747,480.

In 1899 the Presbyterian Church undertook to raise a special thank-offering to commemorate the close of a century of blessing. The amount aimed at was $1,000,000. $600,000 was to be given for the missionary, educational, and benevolent work of the church, and the balance was to be used locally in the removal of debt from church or manse. The amount for the schemes of the church was raised, and the debt fund far exceeded $1,000,000 instead of $400,000. An interesting movement has been going on since 1903 with the view of forming a union between the Methodist, Congregational, and Presbyterian Churches of the Dominion. The joint committee has concluded its work, and the basis formulated has been sent down by the three negotiating bodies (1910), to be considered and voted on by the people. JOHN SOMERVILLE.

IX. In Other Lands: In addition to the organizations in the countries named above, numerous bodies of Presbyterians organized or unorganized are found in many other countries. Thus in the West India Islands, Jamaica has not only a native Presbyterian church with a communicant membership of 13,000 persons, but there are also three other congregations with a membership largely white, and connected with the Church of Scotland. The same church has a presbytery in British Guiana with about a dozen congregations, while on many of the islands there are separate self-supporting congregations. On Trinidad there is another large Presbyterian community of 1,000 native and Hindu Christians. Mission work has been extensively carried on in South America, and in addition to isolated congregations, in almost every large town on its eastern and western sea coast, there are large organizations in Brazil, 10,000 members; Mexico, 5,000 members, with many more in Argentina, and elsewhere, under the supervision of American and European ministers. In lands distinctively non-Christian, there are many native churches, the fruit of the labors of Presbyterian missionaries, as well as single congregations in large towns, for European and American residents or visitors, ministered to, as a rule, by Presbyterian ministers from Great Britain. In Japan (q.v.) the native "Church of Christ," which is Presbyterian, has a communicant membership of 18,000, that of Korea (q.v.) has already more than 30,000, the number in China (q.v.) is not easily ascertained, but may be estimated at 60,000, including Manchuria and Formosa; in India (q.v.) the Presbyterian Church reports 15,000 communicant members, with as many more in the South India Church, exclusive of the Presbyterian chaplaincies and separate congregations with European and American membership in almost every important city in the great peninsula. There is an organized Presbyterian church in Persia (q.v.), consisting of seceders from the native Syrian church, but altogether self-governing and self-supporting. In Egypt (q.v.) there is the Synod of the Nile, whose membership, drawn mainly from the Coptic population, is large. Along the Syrian coast and that of Asia Minor there are energetic Presbyterian missions with congregations at Beirut, Latakia, Alexandretta, Aleppo, Antioch, Tarsus, Adana, Messina, Cyprus, and elsewhere (see SYRIA), so that from a survey of the Presbyterian churches of the world, it appears that about one hundred millions of persons, young and old, should be assigned to the Presbyterian branch of the Christian Church. G. D. MATHEWS.

X. Presbyterian Church Polity.—1. Doctrine: It is necessary to bear in mind in considering the Presbyterian polity that the word "Presbyterian," while at one time designating the adherent of a particular form of church government, has come to have a doctrinal as well as an ecclesiastical signifi-

eanee. The ehurehes holding to the Presbyterian polity have developed in the eourse of their history sueh a natural relation to one great type of Christian doetrine that the words Calvinistie and Presbyterian are to a large extent synonymous. It is, therefore, proper to use the phrase "Presbyterian system" as designating the doetrinal, ethieal, governmental and liturgieal principles and regulations of the Presbyterian ehurehes. The eontrolling idea of the Presbyterian system of thought, both theoretieally and praetieally, is the doetrine of the divine sovereignty. By this sovereignty is meant the absolute eontrol of the universe in all that it contains, whether visible or invisible things, by the one supreme, eternal, omniseient, omnipresent, and omnipotent God for wise, just, holy, and loving ends, known fully alone to himself. This divine sovereignty finds praetieal expression in the Presbyterian system, through its organizing prineiple, the sovereignty of the word of God as the supreme and infallible rule of faith and praetise. The Presbyterian system aeeepts and ineorporates, as a perpetually binding obligation, only those prineiples and regulations which ean be proved to be of Seriptural origin and warrant. It may be maintained that while in other ehurehes than the Presbyterian, the sovereignty of God and the sovereignty of his word are recognized, it is only in those churches which adhere elosely to the Presbyterian system that the logieal outeome in faith, government, and worship of these two great truths, finds definite, general, and vital expression.

2. Polity: The Presbyterian polity, it is maintained, finds elear warrant in the Holy Seriptures. Divine in its origin, one of its ehief lesser sourees was the Jewish eeclesiastieal system of the time of Christ, exeluding the priestly element. In that system the people were associated together in synagogues or eongregations for worship and godly living, and were governed by bodies of men ealled elders (Aets xiii. 15). In eaeh eongregation also, there was an officer known as the ehief ruler of the synagogue, who was the president of the elders, and instruetion was given either by the "legate" of the synagogue or by the doetors of the law (see SYNAGOGUE). The elders also eonstituted the bodies ealled the loeal sanhedrins, whieh exereised judieial funetions within limited districts; while the eontrol of the affairs of the Church-State as a whole was vested in a eouneil eomposed of priests, elders, and seribes, designated as the Great Sanhedrin. Under this Jewish system our Lord lived. One of the first aets of his ministry was performed in the synagogue at Nazareth (Luke iv. 16), and the authority of the synagogue was reeognized by him (Matt. xviii. 17) in the eommand "Tell it unto the ehureh." The general features of the Jewish system were, it is believed, adopted by the primitive Christian Chureh, modified in matters of detail by apostolie authority. The elders of the synagogue beeame the elders of the Christian eongregation (Aets xiv. 23); the ehief ruler of the synagogue was probably reproduced in the *episcopos* or parochial bishop; the local sanhedrin was modified and established as the presbytery; and the Great Sanhedrin was the prototype of synods, general assemblies, and eouncils. The Presbyterian polity, also, finds divine warrant in and gives clear expression to the main principles of ecclesiastical polity set forth in the New Testament. These principles are: (1) The supreme headship of Jesus Christ, as both man and God, involving submission to his law, contained in the Christian Scriptures, as the only rule of faith and praetise. (2) The parity of the ministry as ambassadors or representatives of the Supreme Divine Head of the Church. (3) Partieipation by the people, as members of the household of God, in the government of the Church, through officers chosen by them. (4) The unity of the Church, involving an authoritative eontrol not by individuals, but by representative courts. (5) The right of private judgment in all matters of religion, subject only to the lordship of God over the eonseienee.

1. Scriptural Basis.

These prineiples were essential faetors in the government of the New Testament Church, and as applied in Presbyterian government result in views of the Chureh, her officers, and judieatories as follows:

2. Government.

(1) **Of the Church:** There is an invisible and there is a visible Church. "The catholic or universal Church, which is invisible, consists of the whole number of the elect that have been, are, or shall be gathered into one, under Christ the head thereof." "The visible Church, which is also catholic or universal under the gospel (not confined to one nation as before under the law), consists of all those persons in every nation, together with their children, who make profession of the holy religion of Christ, and of submission to his laws" (Westminster Confession, Chap. xxv.). The name "catholic" or "universal" is therefore the exclusive property of no one communion or denomination, and all churches holding to the fundamentals of the Christian religion are churches of Christ.

(2) **Of Church Power:** The power of the Church is simply ministerial, declarative, and spiritual. It is ministerial, in that the Church exercises power only by Christ's authority. It is declarative, in that the Church is limited to the interpretation of principles and laws already contained in the word of God. The Church can neither add to nor take away from this divine law. It is spiritual, in that the Church is to be concerned alone with ecclesiastical affairs. The Church is not to exercise power in or over the State, neither is the State to usurp authority in or over the Church.

(3) **Of the Particular Church:** The immense multitude of those persons in every nation who make profession of the Christian religion can not meet together in one place, and therefore, "it is reasonable and warranted by Scripture example that they should be divided into many particular churches." Presbyterians hold that without reference to the form of government, "a number of professing Christians, with their offspring, voluntarily associated together, for divine worship and godly living, agreeably to the Holy Scriptures," are a particular church. Every Christian congregation has inherent rights for which it is not dependent upon any alleged superior authority, except as it voluntarily submits to a certain form of government. The only source of authority is Jesus Christ, the great head of the Church.

(4) **Of the Officers of the Church:** (a) **The Ministry:** There is but one order in the ministry, and all ministers are peers each of the other. Denying an apostolical succession of diocesan bishops with authority over ministers, Presbyterians affirm an apostolic succession of apostolic men who have been specially set apart "to prayer and to the ministry of the Word," and who are ordained to their office by ministers alone (Acts vi. 4; II Tim. ii. 2). The distinctive mark of a true minister is not Apostolic Succession (q.v.; also see SUCCESSION, APOSTOLIC) in any sense, but the call of God to the work of preaching a pure Gospel. Further, the diocese of the New Testament bishop was limited to his parish, and every pastor is, therefore, at once both preacher and parochial bishop. "Pastors, not prelates" such are Presbyterian ministers. (b) **The Eldership:** The New-Testament presbyter was a ruler in the local congregation, and was chosen to office by the people (Acts xiv. 23). In each con-

gregation a number of elders were associated together as a court of control, and exercised authority, not as individuals, but as an organized body (Acts xx. 17–28). Every Presbyterian congregation is, therefore, governed by a session composed of elders elected by the people, ordained by ministers, and presided over by the bishop or pastor of the congregation. See PRESBYTER. (c) **The Diaconate:** This office, in its origin, was a provision for the distribution of the benevolence of the Apostolic Church (Acts vi. 1–4; see DEACON, I.). Presbyterian deacons, therefore, are officers charged with the care of the poor, and also may be entrusted with the temporalities of the congregations. They are chosen by the people, and ordained by ministers. In most Presbyterian churches to-day, temporalities are in charge of secular officers known as trustees.

(5) **Of Church Membership:** The terms of admission to the communion of the visible church are the same as the terms or conditions of salvation revealed in the Holy Scriptures, viz., belief in one God, the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ as the divine and all-sufficient savior, involving acceptance of the Bible as the only infallible rule of faith and practise, and the declaration of a sincere purpose to lead a life acceptable to God in Jesus Christ. The Christian churches have no right either to add to or to take from these terms or conditions, and all who have accepted them are brethren in Christ. Church-members, as to their conduct, are under the control of the Church through the pastors and elders as guides in the Christian life, and subject to discipline by the session for offenses (Matt. xviii. 17), provided, however, that every member deeming himself injured by the action of a session may appeal or complain to a higher court.

(6) **Of Church Courts:** The distinguishing feature of Presbyterian government is the church court, the government of representative bodies, and not of individuals. Indeed it derives its distinctive name as a church polity from the "presbytery" of the New Testament, an organization including both ministers and elders. The governing bodies of the particular churches are known as sessions, consisting each of a pastor and a number of elders, elected by the people, and forming the first of the church courts. Fully organized denominational churches have higher or superior courts, known as presbyteries, synods, and general assemblies, through which the four great principles of ecclesiastical polity above mentioned find full expression. A presbytery is a church court exercising authority, legislative, executive, and judicial, over a number of congregations within a limited geographical area, and is composed of all the ministers within said area, with the addition of an elder from each congregation. The presbytery thus exhibits the unity of the church in a visible and tangible form; emphasizes the parity of the ministry, by concentrating the supervisory authority in all its ministerial members; sets forth the rights of the people by the presence of elders as their representatives, ruling conjointly with ministers; and exalts the headship of Christ by magnifying his law as the sole rule of procedure, and the interests of his kingdom as the sole sphere of Christian activity. Synods and general assemblies are but larger presbyteries, necessitated by the extent and numbers of any given denomination, and emphasizing, in a yet more marked manner, the unity of the church. The constitutions of denominational Presbyterian churches provide for a general system of supervision by higher over lower courts in administrative and judicial matters, the power of final decision being vested in the general assembly. The scriptural warrant for the presbytery is found in such passages as I Tim. iv. 14, and for the synod and general assembly in Acts xv. 22–24, and xvi. 14. To this system of government was added, in 1875, the General Council of the "Alliance of the Reformed Churches throughout the World holding the Presbyterian System," which though a merely advisory body, yet recognizes the unity of the universal Christian Church through its world-wide constituency.

3. Worship: Presbyterian worship is in part a matter of polity. It is based as to its character on the facts that a human priesthood is unknown to the New Testament, and that the only priest of the new dispensation is the Lord Jesus Christ. Ministers are not priests, but preachers. Sacerdotalism, therefore, whether in connection with the sacraments, or enforced liturgies, or priestly vestments, has no place in the worship of the Presbyterian churches. The sacraments are simply ordinances, wherein by sensible signs Christ and his benefits "are represented, sealed, and applied to believers." Prayer is the free intercourse of the soul with God, and ought not to be hindered by such human devices as compulsory prayer-books. Ministers are not mediators between God and man, possessed of a delegated divine authority to forgive sins, but simply leaders of the people in all that constitutes the worship of and fellowship with the triune God. True worshipers worship the Father neither in Samaria nor in Jerusalem, but in spirit and in truth.

By its doctrine the Presbyterian system honors the divine sovereignty without denying human responsibility; by its polity it exalts the headship of Christ while giving full development to the activities of the Christian people; and in its worship it magnifies God while it brings blessing to man, by insisting upon the right of free access on the part of every soul to him whose grace can not be fettered in its ministrations by any human ordinances whatsoever.

W. H. ROBERTS.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The Westminster Standards being accepted by all the branches of the Presbyterian Church, nearly all those branches issue these fundamental works through their own boards of publication. For the history of the standards see the article on the subject. The prime sources for history, are, of course, the *Minutes* of the various presbyteries, synods, and general assemblies, which are also issued generally through the boards of publication. Works of general character are R. C. Reed, *Hist. of the Presbyterian Churches of the World*, Philadelphia, 1905; and J. V. Stephens, *The Presbyterian Churches, Divisions, and Unions in Scotland, Ireland, Canada, and America*, ib., 1910. For the more general history of Presbyterianism in **Scotland** consult: D. Calderwood, *Hist. of the Kirk of Scotland*, ed. for Wodrow Society, 8 vols., Edinburgh, 1842–49; T. McCrie, *Sketches of Scottish Church History embracing the Period from the Reformation to the Revolution*, 3d ed., ib., 1843; A. Stevenson, *The History of the Church and State of Scotland, from the Accession of King Charles I to ...1625* , 2d ed., ib. 1844; R. Keith, *Hist. of Affairs in Church and State in Scotland, 1527–68*, ed. for the Spottiswoode Society, 3 vols., ib. 1844–50; F. Stephen, *History of the Church of Scotland, from the Reformation to the Present Time*, 4 vols., London, 1848; W. M. Hetherington, *History of the Church of Scotland, from the Introduction of Christianity to the Disruption, May 18, 1843*, 7th ed., Edinburgh, 1853; J. Anderson, *Ladies of the Reformation*, 2 vols., Glasgow, 1856; J. Lee, *Lectures on the Hist. of the Church of Scotland*, Edinburgh, 1860; idem, *Ladies of the Covenant: Memoirs of Distinguished Scottish Female Characters, Embracing the Period of the Covenant and the Persecution*, New York, 1880; G. Grub, *The Ecclesiastical Hist. of Scotland*, 4 vols., ib. 1861; Hew Scott, *Fasti ecclesiæ Scoticanæ*, 6 vols., London, 1866–71; A. P. Stanley, *Lectures on the Hist. of the Church of Scotland*. ib. 1879; A. H. Charteris. *The Church of the Nineteenth Century to 1843*, in *St. Giles Lectures*, 1 ser., Edinburgh, 1881; J. Tulloch, *The Church of the Eighteenth Century, 1707–1800*, in *St. Giles Lectures*, 1 ser. ib. 1881; J. C. Moffat, *The Church in Scotland. A History of its Antecedents, its Conflicts, and its Advocates . . to the first Assembly of the Reformed Church*, Philadelphia, 1882; J. Cunningham, *Church Hist. of Scotland*, 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1883; A. Edgar, *Old Church Life in Scotland*, London, 2 ser., 1885–86; C. G. McCrie, *Scotland's Place and Part in the Revolution of 1688*, Edinburgh, 1889; A. Williamson, *What has the Church done for Our Colonies?* ib. 1890; R. H. Story, *The Church of Scotland*, 5 vols., London, 1890–91; H. Cowan, *Influence of the Scottish Church in Christendom*, ib. 1896; M. G. J. Kinloch, *Studies in Scottish Ecclesiastical History in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, ib. 1898; P. Hume Brown, *Hist. of Scotland*, 2 vols., Cambridge, 1899–1902; W. R. Taylor,

Religious Thought and Scottish Church Life in the Nineteenth Century, Edinburgh, 1900; C. G. McCrie, *The Church of Scotland; her Divisions and her Reunions*, London, 1901; J. Macpherson, *History of the Church of Scotland from the Earliest Times*, ib. 1901; G. Macleod, *The Doctrine and Validity of the Ministry and Sacraments of the Church of Scotland*, Edinburgh, 1903; H. F. Henderson, *The Religious Controversies of Scotland*, ib. 1905; H. Macpherson, *Scotland's Battles for Spiritual Independence*, London, 1905; *Cambridge Modern History*, v., 279 sqq., New York, 1908.

On the **United Free Church** consult: J. A. Wylie, *Disruption Worthies: a Memorial of 1843*, Edinburgh, 1843; R. Buchanan, *Ten Years' Conflict: History of the Disruption of the Church of Scotland*, 2 vols., Glasgow, 1849; A. Turner, *The Secession of 1843*, Edinburgh, 1859; J. Bryce, *Ten Years of the Church of Scotland, (1833–43)*, 2 vols., ib. 1850; W. Cunningham, *Discourses on Church Principles*, ib. 1863; N. L. Walker, *Scottish Church History*, ib. 1882; H. W. Moncreiff, *The Free Church Principle: its Character and History*, ib. 1883; W. Nicholson, *The Disruption*, London, 1883; T. Brown, *Annals of the Disruption: consisting chiefly of Extracts from the Autograph Narratives of Ministers who left the Scottish Establishment in 1843*, new ed., Edinburgh, 1884; J. C. Johnstone, *The Treasury of the Scottish Covenant*, compiled by J. C. Johnstone, ib. 1887 (a series of extracts from important original documents and productions of contemporaries, covering Scottisb Presbyterianism down to 1876, with an exhaustive bibliography; a most useful book); P. Bayne, *The Free Church of Scotland; her Origin, Founders and Testimony*, ib. 1893, New York, 1894; W G. Blaikie, *After Fifty Years, Letters of a Grandfather on the Jubilee of the Free Church*, London, 1893; T. Brown, *Annals of the Disruption*, Edinburgh, 1893; D. A. Mackinnon, *Some Chapters in the Scottish Church History; A Souvenir of the Jubilee of the Free Church of Scotland*, ib. 1893; G. B. Ryley and J. M. McCandlisb, *Scotland's Free Church. A Historical Retrospect and Memorial of the Disruption, with a Summary of Free Church Progress and Finance, 1843–93*, ib. and New York, 1893; *The Free Church of Scotland Appeals*, ed. R. L. Orr, Edinburgh, 1904 (official report of tbe wbole proceedings in the house of lords in the litigation following tbe union of 1900); A. M. Stewart, *The Origins of the United Free Church in Scotland*, London, 1905; *The Highland Witness of the United Free Church of Scotland*, Glasgow, 1905; *Practice and Procedure in the United Free Church of Scotland*, Edinburgh, 1905 (official guide to the forms of procedure recognized).

On other Scotcb cburches and branches consult: J. Row, *History of the Kirk of Scotland*, 2 vols., London, 1834; J. MacGregor, *The Church of the Present Day*, and *Disestablishment and Disendowment*, contributions to the *St. Giles Lectures*, 1 and 6 series, Edinburgh, 1881, 1886; A. Scott, *The Church from 1843 to 1881 A.D.*, in *St. Giles Lectures*, 1 ser., ib. 1881; P M. Muir, *The Church of Scotland*, London, 1891; J. A. MacClymont, *The Church of Scotland*, Aberdeen, 1892; J. McKerrow, *History of the Secession Church*, 2 vols., Edinburgb and London, new ed. 1848; A. Tbomson, *Historical Sketch of the Origin of the Secession Church and the History of the Rise of the Relief Church*, by G. Strutbers, Edinburgh, 1848; D. Scott, *Annals and Statistics of the Original Secession Church*, ib. 1886; W. Blair, *The United Presby. Church*, Edinburgh, 1888; A. R. MacEwen, *The United Presby. Church*, London, 1898; R. Small, *History of the Congregations of the United Presby. Church from 1733–1900*, 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1904; R. Naismith, *Reformed Presby. Church of Scotland*, ib. 1877; M. Hutchinson, *The Reformed Presby. Church, 1680–1876*, Paisley, 1893; J. Tait, *Two Centuries of the Border Church Life*, Kelso, 1889; J. W. Brown, *The Covenanters of the Merse: their History and Sufferings as found in the Records of that Time*, London, 1893; D. H. Fleming, *Story of the Scottish Covenants in Outline*, Edinburgh, 1904; A. Smellie, *Men of the Covenant*, 7th ed., London, 1909; and the works cited under COVENANTERS, together with tbe *Works* of John Knox.

On Scotch doctrine, worship, polity, and law consult: *Annals of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, from the Final Secession in 1739 to the Origin of the Relief in 1752*, Edinburgh, 1840; A. Peterkin, *Records of the Kirk of Scotland, containing the Acts and Proceedings of the General Assemblies from 1638 . with Notes and historical Illustrations*, ib. 1843; *Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, 1638–1842. Reprinted from the original edition under the Superintendence of the Church Law Society*, ib. 1863; A. Duncan, *The Scottish Sanctuary as it was and as it is. Recent Changes in Public Worship*, ib. 1882; G. W. Sprott, *The Worship of the Church of Scotland*, ib. 1882; *Constitution and Law of the Church of Scotland*, ib. 1884; *Practice of the Free Church in her Courts*, ib. 1886; C. N. Johnston, *Handbook of Scottish Church Defense. Prepared at the Request of the Church Interests Committee of the Church of Scotland*, ib. 1892; C. G. McCrie, *The Public Worship of Presbyterian Scotland historically Treated*, London, 1892; T. Cochrane, *Handbook to the Principal Acts of the Free Church*, Edinburgh, 1900; W. G. Black, *The Parochial Ecclesiastical Law of Scotland*, ib. 1901; A. T. Innes, *The Law of Creeds in Scotland*, ib. 1902; *The Church Union Case. Judgment of the Court of Session 4th July, 1902*, ib. 1902; J. M. Duncan, *The Parochial Ecclesiastical Law of Scotland*, ib. 1903; W. Mair, *A Digest of Laws and Decisions, Ecclesiastical and Civil, Relating to the Church of Scotland*, ib. 1904; *The Free Church Appeals, 1903–04*, ed. R. L. Orr, ib. 1904; *Free Church Union Case, Judgment of the House of Lords, 1st August, 1904*, ib. 1904; C. G. McCrie, *Confessions of the Church of Scotland, their Evolution in History*, ib. 1907.

For Presbyterianism in **England** consult: D. Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans*, ed. J. Toulmin, 5 vols., Bath, 1793–1797; W. Wilson, *Hist. and Antiquities of Dissenting Churches in London*, 4 vols., London, 1808–14; T. McCrie, Jr., *Annals of the English Presbytery*, ib. 1872; J. Black, *Presbyterianism in England in the 18th and 19th Centuries*, ib. 1887; A. H. Drysdale, *Hist. of the Presbyterians in England*, ib. 1889; D. Fraser, *Sound Doctrine. Commentary on the Articles of Faith of the Presbyterian Church of England*, ib. 1892; *Provincial Assembly of Lancashire and Cheshire. Record of the Provincial Assembly of the Presby. Church*, Manchester, 1896; G. B. Howard, *Rise and Progress of Presbyterianism*, London, 1898; K. M. Black, *The Scots Churches in England*, Edinburgb, 1906.

On Presbyterianism in **Ireland** read: P. Adair, *Rise of the Presby. Church in Ireland*, Edinburgb, 1866; J. S. Reid and W. D. Killen, *Hist. of the Presby. Church in Ireland*, new ed., Belfast, 1867; T. Witberow, *Historical and Literary Memorials of Irish Presbyterianism*, 2 vols., ib. 1879; T. Hamilton, *Hist. of the Irish Presby. Church*, Edinburgh, 1888; C. H. Irwin, *History of Presbyterianism in Dublin*, London, 1890; idem, *Hist. of Presbyterianism in the South West of Ireland*, ib. 1890; W. Cleland, *Hist. of the Presby. Church in Ireland*, Toronto, 1891; R. M. Edgar, *Progressive Presbyterianism*, Belfast, 1894; S. Ferguson, *Brief Sketches of some Irish Covenanting Ministers during the Eighteenth Century*, Londonderry, 1897; W. T. Latimer, *A History of Irish Presbyterians*, new ed. Belfast, 1902.

For the general history of Presbyterianism in **America** consult: C. Hodge, *Constitutional Hist. of the Presby. Church*, 2 vols., Philadelphia, 1839–40; R. Webster, *Hist. of the Presby. Church in America*, ib. 1858; W. B. Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, vols. iii.–iv., ix., New York, 1859–69; A. Blaikie, *History of Presbyterianism in New England*, 2 vols., Boston, 1881; C. A. Briggs, *American Presbyterianism*, New York, 1885 (valuable for reprint of documents); T. Murphy, *The Presbytery of the Log College: Cradle of the Presbyterian Church in America*, Philadelphia, 1890; J. W. MacIlvain, *Early Presbyterianism in Maryland*, Baltimore, 1890; G. P. Hays, *Presbyterians; . Origin, Progress, Doctrines, and Achievements*, New York, 1892; *Twentieth Century Addresses*, Philadelphia, 1902; *A Short Hist. of American Presbyterianism . . to the Reunion of 1869*, ib. 1903; C. L. Thompson, *The Presbyterians*, New York, 1903.

Works on the history of the Nortbern and Southern Churches are: E. H. Gillett, *Hist. of the Presby. Church in the U. S. A.*, 2 vols., rev. ed., Pbiladelphia, 1873; R. E. Thompson, in *American Church History Series*, vol. vi., New York, 1895; W. H. Foote, *Sketches of Virginia*, 2 series, Pbiladelphia, 1850–55; G. Howe, *Hist. of the Presbyterian Church in South Carolina*, 2 vols., Columbia, 1870–83; W. A. Alexander, *Digest of the Acts of the General Assembly*, Richmond, 1888; R. L. Dabney, *Discussions*, 3 vols., ib. 1890–92; T. C. Johnson, *Hist. of the Southern Presby. Church*, in *American Church History Series*, vol. xi., New York, 1894; E. D. Morris, *The Presbyterian Church New School, 1837–1869*, Columbus, 1905.

On the Cumberland Church, for history consult: J. Smith, *History of the Christian Church including a history of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church*, Nashville, Tenn., 1835; F. R. Cossitt, *The Life and Times of the Rev. Finis Ewing, one of the Fathers and Founders of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church*, ib. 1853; R. Beard, *Biographical Sketches of the Early Ministers of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church*, 2 vols., ib. 1867; E. B. Crisman, *Origin and Doctrines of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church*, ib. 1875; T. C. Blake, *Old Log House: History and Defense of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church*, ib. 1878; *Semi-Centennial Exercises and Addresses*, ib. 1880; B. W. McDonnold, *History of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church*, ib. 1888 (much the fullest work published on this subject); R. V. Foster, in *American Church History Series*, vol. xi., New York, 1894. For the doctrine consult: Finis Ewing, *Lectures on Theological Subjects*, Nashville, 1824; R. Donnell, *Thoughts on Various Theological Subjects*, ib. 1852; R. Beard (formerly professor of systematic theology in the seminary at Lebanon), *Lectures on Theology*, 3 vols., ib. 1870; idem, *Why am I a Cumberland Presbyterian?* ib. 1874; S. G. Burney, *The Doctrine of Election*, ib. 1879; idem, *Baptismal Regeneration*, ib. 1880; idem, *Atonement and Law Reviewed*, ib. 1888; idem, *Soteriology*, ib. 1889; idem, *Studies in Ethics and Psychology*, ib. 1891; T. C. Blake, *Compend of Theology*, ib. 1880; W. J. Darby, *Our Position*, ib. 1889 (a pamphlet); R. V. Foster, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, ib. 1891; idem, *Our Doctrines*, ib. 1897; idem, *Systematic Theology*, ib. 1898; J. M. Howard, *Creed and Constitution of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church*, ib. 1892; A. B. Miller, *Doctrine and Genius of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church*, ib. 1892; J. R. Collingsworth, *Pseudo Church Doctrine*, 1892.

On other Presbyterian churches in the United States and for the brotherhood consult: W. M. Glasgow, *Hist. of the Reformed Presby. Church in America*, Baltimore, 1888; J. P Miller, *Biographical Sketches of the First Ministers of the Associate Church in America*, Albany, 1829; R. Latham, *Hist. of the Associate Reformed Synod of the South*, Harrisburg, 1882; J. B. Scouller, *History of the United Presby. Church of North America*, in *American Church History Series*, vol. xi., New York, 1894; T. Hancock, *Church Error: or, instrumental Music condemned*, Dallas, Texas, 1902; J. B. Scouller, *Manual of the United Presby. Church of N. A.*, Pittsburg, 1888; idem, in *American Church History Series*, vol. xi., New York, 1894; *Presbyterian Brotherhood. Reports of the First Convention*, Indianapolis, Nov. 13–15, 1906, Philadelphia, 1907, and *Report of the Second Convention*, Nov. 12–14, 1907, ib. 1908, and of the third, ib. 1909.

On the Presbyterian Churches of **Canada** and **Victoria** consult: G. Bryce, *The Presbyterian Church in Canada*, Toronto, 1875; W. Gregg, *Hist. of the Presbyterian Church in Canada*, ib. 1885; *Canada Presbyterian Church. Rules and Forms of Procedure in the Church Courts*, ib. 1903; R. Hamilton, *History of the Presbyterian Church of Victoria*, Melbourne, 1888.

On Presbyterian **Doctrine, Polity** and **Government** consult: R. Baxter, *Five Disputations*, London, 1659; S. Miller, *Presbyterianism*, Philadelphia, 1835; D. King, *Defence of the Presby. Form of Church Government*, Edinburgh, 1854; T. Witherow, *Which is the Apostolic Church?* Belfast, 1856, Philadelphia, 1879; W. E. Moore, *New Digest of the Acts and Deliverances of the Presby. Church, New School*, Philadelphia, 1861; idem, *The Presbyterian Digest, United Church*, ib. 1873; A. A. Hodge, *Commentary on the Confession of Faith*, Philadelphia, 1869; C. Hodge, *Discussions in Church Polity*, New York, 1879; A. T. McGill, *Church Government*, Philadelphia, 1889; J. A. Hodge, *What is Presby. Law as defined by Church Courts?* ib. 1891; L. Sobkowski, *Episkopat und Presbyterat in den ersten christlichen Jahrhunderten*, Würzburg, 1893; D. D. Bannerman, *Worship, Order and Polity of the Presby. Church*, Edinburgh, 1894; A. Wright, *The Presby. Church; its Worship, Functions and Orders*, ib. 1895; J. N. Ogilvie, and A. C. Zenos, *The Presby. Churches: their Place in Modern Christendom*, New York, 1896; R. E. Prime, *The Elder in his Ecclesiastical Relations*, ib. 1896; A. King, *The Ruling Elder*, London, 1898; E. W Smith, *The Creed of Presbyteries*, Toronto, 1902; W. Paterson, *The Church of the New Testament, the Presbyterate*, London, 1903; *Constitution of the Presby. Church in the U. S. of America*, Philadelphia, 1904; W. H. Roberts, *Manual for Ruling Elders and Other Church Officers*, ib. 1905; J. V. Stephens, *Presbyterian Government*, Nashville, 1907; W. M. Macphail, *The Presbyterian Church. A Brief Account of its Doctrine, Worship, and Polity*, London, 1908; *Directory and Forms for Public Worship. Issued by the Church Worship Association of the United Free Church of Scotland*, Edinburgh, 1909.

PRESBYTERIUM: A body of elders, Jewish (Luke xxii. 66; Acts xxii. 5) or Christian (I Tim. iv. 14).

PRESBYTERY: An ecclesiastical term having two distinct uses. (1) The part of the church, behind the altar, which contained seats for the bishops and presbyters (priests), divided from the rest by rails, so that none but clergy might enter it. (2) An ecclesiastical court of Presbyterian churches, next in rank above the session, composed of all the ministers, and one elder from each church within a certain radius, and having jurisdiction over the ministers composing it, over the candidates for the ministry and licentiates, and over the churches within its bounds. See Polity, Ecclesiastical; and Presbyterians, X.

PRESENCE AND PRESENCE FEES: The personal discharge of ecclesiastical duties by each incumbent upon whom the duties in question devolve, and the emoluments connected with the performance of such duties. Every incumbent of an ecclesiastical position is required to administer it in person, unless he may legally have a representative and leave of absence (see Residence). Personal presence is especially required of all those who are bound to recite the canonical hours in choir; and according to the Council of Vienne (1311), this is the case in cathedral, monastic, and collegiate churches, other churches being governed by their own usage. Those who do not conform to this regulation not only incur other penalties, but also forfeit their presence fees and consolations. The presence fees are those emoluments which are daily earned by personal attendance, and are distributed either daily or weekly. The consolations are emoluments in money or in kind (wine, poultry, eggs, etc.) which are distributed at fixed intervals; and they also include oblations, or revenues from anniversary masses, masses for the dead, and the like. Since, however, these presence fees and revenues were not forthcoming in every religious foundation, the Council of Trent enacted that a third of all incomes and revenues should daily be distributed among such of the clergy as were actually present. Otherwise the daily revenues should accrue to the remaining clergy in residence, or should be devoted to the improvement of the church building or, at the discretion of the bishop, to some other pious institution. E. Sehling.

PRESENTATION OF THE VIRGIN MARY, FEAST OF THE. See Mary, Mother of Jesus Christ, III.

PRESIDING ELDERS. See Methodists, IV., 1, § 8.

PRESSENSÉ, prê'sɑn''sê', **EDMOND (DEHAULT) DE:** French Protestant; b. at Paris Jan. 7, 1824; d. there Apr. 8, 1891. He was educated at the Col-

lège Bourbon and the Collège Sainte Foy; and after studying theology at Lausanne (1842–45), he became, in 1847, assistant pastor of the Chapelle Taitbout in Paris, becoming pastor two years later and retaining this position until 1871. He was elected to the National Assembly for the Department of the Seine in 1871, where he joined the Republican Left, and fought with Gambetta against the monarchist and clerical restoration. On the dissolution of the assembly he retired from political life until 1883, when he became a member of the Senate for life, being president of the Left Center after 1888. Pressensé's political career did not interfere with his religious duties. Though he had resigned his pastorate in 1871 he preached continually both in his old pulpit and throughout France and French Switzerland, while he was long the president of the Commission synodale de l'union des églises libres évangéliques de France. An enthusiastic advocate of the free-church system, he was as catholic in church relations as in theology. Throughout his life he cultivated all forms of Protestantism, and many Roman Catholics were among his friends. Amid all his activities he found time for authorship. He published, among other works, eight *Conférences sur le christianisme dans ses applications aux questions sociales* (Paris, 1849); *Du catholicisme en France* (1851); *Histoire des trois premiers siècles de l'église chrétienne* (4 vols., 1858–1877; Eng. transl., *The Early Years of Christianity*, London, 1869–78); *Discours religieux* (1859); *L'École critique et Jésus-Christ* (1863); *L'Église et la révolution française* (1864, new ed., 1889; Eng. transl., *Religion and the Reign of Terror*, New York, 1869); *Jésus-Christ, son temps, sa vie, son œuvre* (1865, new ed., 1884; Eng. transl., *Jesus Christ: His Times, Life, and Work*, 4th ed., London, 1871); *Études évangéliques* (1867; Eng. transl., *Mystery of Suffering and Other Discourses*, London, 1868); *Le Concile du Vatican, son histoire et ses conséquences politiques et religieuses* (1872); *La Liberté religieuse en Europe depuis 1870* (1874); *Le Devoir* (1875); *La Question ecclésiastique en 1877* (1878); *Études contemporaines* (1880; Eng. transl., *Contemporary Portraits*, New York, 1880); *Les Origines* (1883; Eng. transl., *A Study of Origins*, London, 1883); *Variétés morales et politiques* (1886); *Les Églises libres de France et la réforme française* (1887); and *A. Vinet, d'après ses correspondances inédites* (1890). He was also a prolific contributor to the periodical press, and in 1854 founded the *Revue chrétienne*, of which he was editor at the time of his death. (EUGEN LACHENMANN.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Hyacinthe Loyson, *Edmond de Pressensé*, Paris, 1891; Lichtenberger, *ESR*, xiii. 164. A very full list of the works is found in H. P. Thieme, *Guide bibliographique de la littérature française*, pp. 324–325, Paris, 1907.

PRESSLY, JOHN TAYLOR: United Presbyterian; b. in Abbeville District, S. C., Mar. 28, 1795; d. at Allegheny, Pa., Aug. 13, 1870. He was graduated at Transylvania University, Ky., 1812, and studied theology under John Mitchell Mason (q.v.); he was ordained and installed, 1816, pastor of the Cedar Spring congregation, the one in which he had been brought up; and was professor of theology in the theological seminary, and pastor at Allegheny, Pa., after 1832. He took a leading part in organizing the United Presbyterian Church, which in 1858 was formed out of the Associate and Associate Reformed Presbyterian Churches; and the strength of this denomination in Pittsburg and its neighborhood is largely due to him. As preacher, pastor, and professor, he exerted a lasting influence upon his denomination.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: F. Piper, *Lives of the Leaders of our Church Universal*, ed. H. M. MacCracken, pp. 778–783, Philadelphia, 1879.

PRESTER JOHN: A legendary Christian king of Asia, who in the twelfth century was supposed to have conquered the Mohammedans in a bloody battle and to have protected the crusaders. Bishop Otto of Freising, followed by Alberic, in his chronicle for 1145, relates that a bishop of Gabula told Pope Eugene III. of a Nestorian king and priest named Presbyter Johannes, who ruled "beyond Persia and Armenia," the double office being due to a confusion of *kam* ("priest") with *khan* ("prince"). In his chronicle on 1165, moreover, Alberic states that Prester John, "the king of the Indians," sent letters to various Christian rulers, especially to Manuel of Constantinople and the Roman Emperor Frederick. Influenced by rumors of such a king, Alexander III. sent his physician in ordinary in search of the monarch, directing his letter, dated at Venice Sept. 27, 1177, "to the king of the Indians, the most holy of priests," but the messenger disappeared without leaving a trace.

A new epoch for the legend began with the Dominican and Franciscan missions to the East after 1245. The majority of reports agreed that Prester John no longer lived, but had fallen in battle with Genghis Khan, the chief authority for this form of the legend being the Franciscan Wilhelmus Rubruquis. On Jan 8, 1305, the archbishop of Peking, John of Monte Corvino (q.v.), told of a King George of the Nestorian sect, a descendant of the famous Prester John of India. This monarch had ruled in a land called Tenduch, twenty days distant, had become a convert to the Roman Catholic faith, and, after receiving minor orders, had ministered in his royal robes. This king, termed by Marco Polo the sixth after Prester John, had died in 1299. The fall of the Mongol dynasty in China in 1368 put an end to the missions in the East, but the way was already prepared for the third, or African, phase of the legend by the vague use of the term "India" and the accounts of a Christian kingdom of "Abascia" in middle India. This transfer from Asia to Africa was aided by the similarity of the names of the Abchases in the Caucasus (also called Abasi and Abassini) and the Abyssinians. The Roman Catholic Jordanus, bishop of Quilon in southern India, called the king of Ethiopia simply John. Envoys of this monarch appeared in Europe c. 1400, and when the Portuguese undertook to voyage to the East Indies, they were encouraged in great part by the fame of the realm of Prester John, and when they found the Christians of St. Thomas in Malabar, they fancied that region a Christian kingdom.

A careful study of medieval travels led to the

identification with Prester John of Unk Khan, whom Rubruquis and others had declared to be the brother of a Nestorian King John, who had ruled over the Naymans, but had gained the throne of the Catai or Caracatai after the death of Coir Khan. Others saw in the Tibetan Lama an apostate descendant of the mythical king, and still others brought the so-called Christians of St. John into the discussion. In 1839 M. A. P. Avezac-Macaya investigated the legend of Prester John (*Recueil de voyages et de memoires publié par la Société de Geographie*, IV., 547–654), and identified the Coir Khan of Rubruquis with the Ghaur Khan, the founder of the kingdom of Qara-Khithay, who was a Buddhist, but apparently had many Nestorian subjects. This prince, called Yeliu Tashe by the Chinese, was succeeded in 1136 by his son Yeliu Yliei, and in 1155 by his grandson Tchiluku. In 1208 the latter made the Nayman Prince Kushluk his son-in-law, only to meet his death at the hands of his thankless protégé, who in his turn was killed in 1218 by Genghis Khan. Rubruquis took the title Ghaur Khan as a proper name, fused the first three princes into one, and finally gave ground to the confusion with Unk Khan, who was killed by Genghis Khan fifteen years before Kushluk.

According to Gustav Oppert Ghaur Khan or Kor Khan was changed by phonetic laws to Yor Khan, which was corrupted through the Hebrew *Yohannan* and the Syriac *Yuḥanan* into Johannes. It is a historic fact, moreover, that Kushluk's wife, the daughter of the last Ghaur Khan, was a Christian, and that descendants of this royal family who later ruled in Tenduch were also Christians and ruled over a Christian population. (W. Germann†.)

Bibliography: F. Zarncke, in the *Abhandlungen* of the Saxon Academy of Sciences, philological-historical class, vol. vii., 1879, vol. viii., 1883–86; G. Oppert, *Der Presbyter Johannes in Sage und Geschichte*, 2d ed., Berlin, 1870; G. Brunet, *La Légende du Prêtre-Jean*, Bordeaux, 1877; S. Baring-Gould, *Curious Myths of the Middle Ages*, London, 1884; Schaff, *Christian Church*, v. 1, pp. 437–439.

PRESTON, JOHN: Puritan; b. at Upper Heyford (6 m. w. of Northampton) in the latter half of 1587; d. at Preston-Capes (12 m. w.s.w. of Northampton) July 20, 1628. He was educated at King's College (1604–06) and Queen's College, Cambridge (1606–07), and became fellow at the latter, 1609. He took orders and became dean and catechist at Queen's. On the nomination of the duke of Buckingham, he was made chaplain to Prince Charles, preacher at Lincoln's Inn, and master of Emanuel College (1622). He was the chaplain-in-waiting at the death of King James I. (1625). In his closing years, his stanch Puritanism cost him the duke's patronage. As a preacher, he attracted great attention. He was also a vigorous defender of Calvinism. His writings were very popular; a few of which are: *The New Covenant, or the Saints' Portion* (London, 1629); *The Saint's Daily Exercise* (1629); and *The Breastplate of Faith* (1630).

Bibliography: *The Life of the Renowned Doctor Preston*, written by Thomas Ball in 1628, was abridged by Samuel Clarke and several times printed, e.g., in *Lives of Thirty-two English Divines*, pp. 75 sqq., London, 1677, and is edited by E. W. Harcourt, Oxford, 1885. Consult further: D. Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans*, ed. J. Toulmin, ii. 124 sqq., 5 vols., Bath, 1793–97; B. Brooke, *Lives of the Puritans*, ii. 356 sqq., 3 vols., London, 1813; *DNB*, xlvi. 308–312 (gives a list of twenty-four works).

PRESTON, THOMAS SCOTT: Roman Catholic; b. at Hartford, Conn., July 23, 1824; d. in New York Nov. 4, 1891. He was brought up in the Protestant Episcopal Church; was graduated from Trinity College, Hartford, 1843, and from the General Theological Seminary, New York, 1846; was ordained in 1846, and served as assistant rector at the Church of the Annunciation and subsequently at St. Luke's, both in New York City, till 1849, when he entered the Roman Catholic Church; he studied a year at St. Joseph's Seminary, Fordham, and was ordained priest in 1850; served as assistant at the cathedral in New York and at St. Mary's, Yonkers; became chancellor of the diocese of New York in 1853 and vicar-general in 1873, and was also rector of St. Anne's, New York, after 1861. Among his books are: *Sermons for the Principal Seasons of the Sacred Year* (New York, 1864); *Christian Unity* (1867); *Reason and Revelation* (1868); *Christ and the Church* (1870); *Catholic View of the Public School System* (1870); *The Vicar of Christ* (1871); *Divine Paraclete: Sermons* (1880); *Protestantism and the Bible* (1880); and *God and Reason* (1884).

PREUSCHEN, ERWIN FRIEDRICH WILHELM FERDINAND: German Protestant; b. at Lissberg (not far from Frankfort), Hesse, Jan. 8, 1867. He was educated at the University of Giessen (lic. theol., 1891), and after being an assistant to A. Harnack at Berlin in the preparation of his *Bestand der altchristlichen Literatur* (1891–93); held various pastorates in Hesse-Darmstadt until 1897; was a teacher in a gymnasium at Darmstadt (1897–1907), where he was appointed professor in 1907. In theology he holds that "an investigation of the original form of Christianity as an absolute religion is the only justifiable foundation of theological activity and Christian knowledge, such an investigation to be uninfluenced by philosophical categories and ecclesiastical dogmas." He has written *Analekta, kürzere Texte zur Geschichte der alten Kirche und des Kanons* (Freiburg, 1893); *Palladius und Rufinus* (Giessen, 1897); *Antilegomena, die Reste der ausserkanonischen Evangelien und urchristlichen Ueberlieferungen* (1901); *Zwei gnostische Hymnen* (1904); *Leitfaden der biblischen Geographie* (1904); *Kirchengeschichte für die deutsche Familie* (Reutlingen, 1905); and *Vollständiges griechisch-deutsches Handwörterbuch zu den Schriften des N T* (Giessen, 1908 sqq.). He has also edited Tertullian's *De pœnitentia et de pudicitia* (Freiburg, 1891) and *De præscriptione hæreticorum* (1892), as well as Origen's commentary on St. John (Leipsic, 1903), while in 1900 he founded the *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, of which he has since been the editor. He has translated E. Hatch's *Greek Ideas and Usages, their Influence upon the Christian Church* (London, 1890) under the title *Griechentum und Christentum* (Freiburg, 1892) and the Armenian version of the sixth and seventh books of the church history of Eusebius (Leipsic, 1902).

PRICE, HORACE MACCARTIE EYRE: Church of England bishop; b. at Malvern (36 m. s.w. of

Birmingham), England, Aug. 3, 1863. He received his education at Trinity College, Cambridge (B.A., 1885; M.A., 1889); was ordained deacon, 1886, and priest, 1888; entered the service of the Church Missionary Society, in which he remained, except for a year, till his consecration as bishop of Fuh-Kien, China, in 1906. His appointments were: missionary and vice-principal of the Fourah Bay College, Sierra Leone, 1886–89; curate of Wingfield, Suffolk, 1889–90; principal of the society's boys' school at Osaka, Japan, 1890–97; acting secretary for the society at Osaka, 1897–98; principal of the society's divinity school in the same city, 1900–03, and secretary for the society, 1899–1904; did missionary work there, till 1906, acting also as examining chaplain to the bishop of Osaka, 1899–1906, as archdeacon of Osaka, 1901–06, and as secretary for the society in central Japan, 1904–1906. These posts he left to take up the duties of his bishopric.

PRICE, IRA MAURICE: Baptist; b. at Welsh Hills, near Newark, O., Apr. 29, 1856. He was educated at Denison University, Granville, O. (B.A., 1879), the Baptist Union Theological Seminary (B.D., 1882), and the University of Leipsic (Ph.D., 1886). He was professor of Greek and modern languages in Des Moines College, Des Moines, Ia. (1879–80), instructor in French and German in Morgan Park Military Academy (1880–83), instructor in Hebrew in Wheaton Theological Seminary (1882–83), and instructor in the Correspondence School of Hebrew (1882–84). After his return from Germany he was instructor (1886–88) and professor (1888–92) of Hebrew in Baptist Union Theological Seminary, and in 1892 was appointed associate professor of Semitic languages and literatures in the University of Chicago, where he has been full professor of the same subjects since 1900. In 1902–08 he was a member of the International Sunday School Lesson Committee, of which he was made secretary in the latter year, and in 1906 he was Gay Lecturer in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary. He has written *Introduction to the Inscriptions discovered by Mons. E. de Sarzac* (Munich, 1887); *Syllabus of Old Testament History* (New York, 1891); *The Great Cylinder Inscriptions (A and B) of Gudea*, part 1 (Leipsic, 1899); *The Monuments and the Old Testament* (Chicago, 1899); *Some Literary Remains of Rim-Sin (Arioch) of Larsa* (1905); and *The Ancestry of our English Bible* (Philadelphia, 1907).

PRIDE: An unwarranted feeling of self-sufficiency, usually manifested by an arrogant bearing and a disregard of the worth of others. The word is used both in a religious and in an ethical sense; but the two forms of pride are closely related, since pride toward God is also directed against society, while arrogance toward one's fellows becomes arrogance toward God. At present the word is employed chiefly in the ethical sense. In the Bible, however, where pride is contrasted with humility, it is the religious sense of the word that prevails. God hates "a haughty look" (Prov. vi. 17), and in his sight all manifestations of pride are an "abomination" (Luke xvi. 15). In the New Testament the Old-Testament contrast between pride and humility is made the basis of the distinction between Pharisaical piety and true religion. While humility is that feeling of dependence which necessarily accompanies faith and love toward God, pride is that self-assurance, or self-righteousness, which prevents one from feeling the need of the grace of God in Jesus Christ. Considered ethically, pride consists in self-exaltation, with correlative depreciation of others. Aside from moral and religious pride there is social pride, which, when combined with benevolence, becomes condescension. In the religious field the worst form of pride is intellectual pride, which carries with it the danger of hypocrisy (Luke xviii. 11–14). Since the normal religious consciousness includes absolute trust in God, while pride is characterized by trust in one's own powers, it is evident that pride is an obstacle to salvation. The transition from the sinful state to the state of grace is possible only in the experience of absolute dependence upon God, and of utter powerlessness to save oneself. From its very nature, faith excludes pride. However, pride persists in Christian life as a blot and a sign of disease.

The conception of pride was completely shifted by the rise and development of Roman Catholicism. Through the authority of the Roman hierarchy submission to the Church and its teachings was substituted for submission to God by faith, and any attempt to separate from the Church was looked upon as wanton arrogance and self-exaltation. Hence, pride came to be regarded by the Church as the basal sin. Since in the monastic orders obedience (i.e., humility and self-renunciation) was the chief requirement, any refractory independence was identified with pride. By this suppression of personality, pride, or *superbia*, was shifted into the category of the worst, or the very root-sin. Augustine repeatedly characterizes *superbia* as the chief and basal sin, the source of all other sins, and praises *obedientia* as the *maxima virtus*. Prudentius calls *superbia* "the root of all evil." This conception was introduced into scholasticism by Peter Lombard in the "Sentences." He makes *superbia* the first of the seven mortal sins and deduces from it all other sins. It is made to account for the fall of the first man, and even of the devil. The fall of man is still too often ascribed to pride (the wishing to "be as God"), which makes the thing to be explained the explanation; for if the origin of sin is to be explained, and pride is sin, it must be shown whence pride arose. If the essence of sin is selfishness, pride can not be regarded as a special sin either toward man or toward God; in both relations it is the evidence of a false and exaggerated estimate of one's own worth, wherein the sin consists. (L. LEMME.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: C. E. Luthardt, *Saving Truths of Christianity*, p. 89, Edinburgh, 1868; J. Martineau, *Types of Ethical Theory*, ii. 238, Oxford, 1889.

PRIDEAUX, HUMPHREY: Orientalist; b. at Padstow (25 m. w.n.w. of Plymouth), Cornwall, May 3, 1648; d. at Norwich Nov. 1, 1724. He was educated at Christ Church, Oxford (B.A., 1672; M.A., 1675; B.D., 1682); and published *Marmora Oxoniensa* (Oxford, 1676), a transcript of the inscription on the Arundel Marbles (containing

many typographical errors). In consequence of this work, the lord-chancellor, Heneage Finch, gave him the living of St. Clement's, near Oxford, 1679, and a prebend in Norwich Cathedral, 1681. He was appointed also, in 1679, Busby's Hebrew lecturer in Christ College, in 1683 rector of Bladon, Oxfordshire, in 1688 archdeacon of Suffolk, and in 1702 dean of Norwich. He wrote two famous works: *The True Nature of Imposture Displayed in the Life of Mahomet* (London, 1697; 9th ed., Dublin, 1730); and *The Old and New Testament Connected in the History of the Jews and Neighbouring Nations* (2 vols., London, 1716–18; best ed., the 25th, by J. T. Wheeler, 1858, reedited, 1876; commonly called "Prideaux's Connection"), this calling forth several works animadverting upon Prideaux' conclusions. The first of these works maintains with great learning and prejudice the lowest view of Mohammed's character; the second presents a mass of erudition upon all relevant topics.

Bibliography: His *Letters . . to John Ellis, Under Secretary of State . . 1674–1722*, E. M. Thompson edited for the Camden Society, London, 1875. His *Life* appeared anonymously, London, 1748. Consult further: A. à Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses*, ed. P. Bliss, iv. 656, and the *Fasti*, ii. 331, 348, 384, 400, 4 vols., London, 1813–20; J. Foster, *Alumni Oxonienses*, iii. 1212, ib. 1887.

PRIDEAUX, JOHN: Church of England bishop of Worcester; b. at Stowford, near Ivybridge (10 m. e. of Plymouth), Sept. 17, 1758; d. at Bredon (38 m. s.s.w. of Birmingham) July 29, 1650. He matriculated at Exeter College, Oxford (B.A., 1600; M.A., 1603; B.D., 1611; D.D., 1612); took orders soon after receiving his master's degree; became chaplain to Prince Henry; fellow of the college at Chelsea in 1609; rector of Exeter College, 1612; vicar of Bampton, 1614; regius professor of divinity, 1615; canon of Christ Church, 1616; vicar of Chalgrove and canon at Salisbury, 1620; rector of Ewelme, 1629; was five times vice-chancellor of the university; and was appointed bishop of Worcester, 1641. He was a loyalist, and the surrender of Worcester to the Parliamentary forces in 1646 ended his episcopate; he spent his last years in poverty with his son-in-law, rector of Bredon. He was a diligent writer, mainly in Latin, his principal works in English being *The Doctrine of the Sabbath* (London, 1634), and *Sacred Eloquence* (1659); he also wrote on devotional subjects.

Bibliography: *DNB*, xlvi. 354-356, where references to scattering notices are given.

PRIERIAS, SILVESTER (SILVESTRO MAZZOLINI): Italian Dominican and opponent of Luther; b. at Priero (40 m. w. of Genoa) about 1456; d. at Rome at the beginning of 1523. He entered the Dominican monastery of Santa Maria di Castello in Genoa at the age of fifteen, and eight years later was ordained priest. From 1490 to about the end of the century he was studying and teaching at Bologna and Padua, and after being prior of several monasteries was vicar general of the province of Lombardy (1508–10), being at the same time inquisitor in Brixen and vicinity. In 1511 he became inquisitor in the district of Milan, and two years later was prior at Cremona. Meanwhile he had written a series of theological works including his *Compendium Capreoli* (1497), *Tractatulus de diabolo* (1502), *Aurea rosa* (1503), *Tractatus de expositione missæ* (1509), *Malleus contra Scotistas* (1514), and especially his *Summa summarum quæ Silvestrina dicitur* (Bologna, 1515; reprinted forty times), a work neither balanced nor original but a comprehensive practical theology. It brought him the fame of an erudite Thomist, and about the middle of 1514, Pope Leo X. called him to Rome to take the Dominican chair of Thomistic theology at the Gymnasium Romanum; and in the following year, through the influence of Cajetan (q.v.), he was appointed master of the sacred palace. Thus he became a councilor of the pope in matters of faith and inquisitor within the city, and was also empowered to act as inquisitor and judge in matters of faith affecting the entire Church. He was influential in securing the condemnation of Reuchlin. As censor he considered the theses of Luther and within three days composed his *Dialogus in præsumptuosas Martini Lutheri conclusiones de potestate papæ* (1518). Without having an inkling that it was a religious question with Luther, Prierias, in order to draw out Luther's fundamentals, set forth in four theses the most extreme views on the infallibility of the Church, concluding that any one asserting that the Church could not do what she did (specifically regarding indulgences) must be adjudged a heretic. Luther, who received this trivial work in Aug., 1518, wrote a reply in two days, while Prierias answered briefly in his *Replica* (1519?) and the German reformer scornfully advised Prierias in a letter now lost not to make himself ridiculous. Prierias, who had meanwhile been officially commissioned to examine Luther's utterances, published, in 1519, an *Epitoma responsionis ad Martinum Lutherum* (Perugia, 1519), which was, in short, an index of the contents of a comprehensive work which he had meanwhile begun and which appeared as *Errata et argumenta Martini Luteris recitata, detecta, repulsa et copiosissime trita* (Rome, 1519). This was to prove that the papal decision in matters of faith and doctrine was divinely inspired and could be rejected only under penalty of eternal death. Luther published this work, like its predecessors, with a violent preface and appendix, and caustic marginal comments. He could even be half doubtful whether Prierias' statements really represented true Roman doctrine; but Leo X. declared, in a brief of July 21, 1520, that Prierias had written canonically against Luther, and threatened with excommunication and heavy fine any unlicensed reprinting of the work. It always remained an important document for the Roman Catholic doctrine of the period concerning the powers of the pope. Such was the influence of Prierias that Erasmus was forced, despite his hatred of him, to take refuge with him from the Carmelites of Louvain. Other works are *Conflatum ex Sancto Thoma* (with a list of his own writings; Perugia, 1519); and *De strigimagarum dæmonumque mirandis libri tres* (Rome, 1521). (T. Kolde.)

Bibliography: J. Quétif and J. Échard, *Scriptores ordinis prædicatorum*, ii. 52 sqq., Paris, 1721; F. Michalski, *De Silvestri Prieriatis . . vita et scriptis*, Münster, 1892; and the lives of Luther by Köstlin, Kolde, and Jacobs (see under Luther, Martin).

PRIEST, PRIESTHOOD.

I. In the Old Testament.
1. Name and Conception.
2. History.
Origins (§ 1).
To the Division of the Kingdom (§ 2).
The Regal Period (§ 3).
Exile to New-Testament Times (§ 4).
3. Organization.
Ranks and Grades (§ 1).
Post-Exilic Arrangements (§ 2).
4. Position and Duties.
Teaching Functions (§ 1).
Sacrificial and Other Functions (§ 2).
5. Consecration, Manner of Life.
Consecration (§ 1).
Apparel; Manner of Life (§ 2).
6. Perquisites.
II. In the Christian Church.
Early and Patristic Conceptions (§ 1).
The Medieval Church (§ 2).
The Roman Doctrine (§ 3).
Anglican Conception (§ 4).

I. In the Old Testament: 1. Name and Conception: The usual designation of a priest in the Old Testament is *kohen*, which is reproduced in Aramaic, Phenician, and Ethiopian. The Arabic *kahin* signifies "seer," "truth-teller," showing a specialization of function. The etymology of the word is yet in doubt. The word *kemarim*, A. V., "chemarim" (Hos. x. 5; Zeph. i. 4), is used only of idolatrous priests (II Kings xxiii. 5), while *mal'ak*, "messenger," is used of the priest only in a figurative sense (Mal. ii. 7; Eccles. v 6). The Old Testament assumes a priesthood to be a universally established institution, making mention of Melchizedek (q.v.) and of an Egyptian priesthood (Gen. xli. 45, 50, etc.); Moses became the son-in-law of Jethro, a priest of Midian. The inferences that have been drawn from the relationship between Moses and Jethro (Ex. ii. 16, 21, iii. 1, iv. 18, xviii. 1–12) have not been entirely justified. While there may have been connections between the priesthood of Yahweh founded by Moses and the Midianitic-Kenitic priesthood of Jethro, these relationships were due to the long intercourse between the Israelites and the Midianitic-Kenitic tribes of the Sinai peninsula (see Moses). The originality of Moses as the founder of the Israelitic priesthood and of the religion of Yahweh remains unquestionable. The individuality of the law for the priests delivered by Moses in the name of Yahweh must be considered the outcome of his own life's work; how many of the peculiarities were borrowed by him from the wider Semitic field is uncertain, especially since the age of various inscriptions bearing on the subject has not been fully determined (see Hammurabi and his Code; Hexateuch). The priesthood of the Phenician Baal threatened under Jezebel to become established in Israel (I Kings xvi. 31–32). Priests of Baal existed in the northern kingdom (II Kings x. 19), and a priest of Baal in Jerusalem, named Matthan, is referred to in II Kings xi. 18. The opponents of Elijah (q.v.) on Mt. Carmel are called prophets (see Prophets, Prophecy) although they were undoubtedly priests.

2. History: Priestly individuals are to be found among the Israelitic tribes before the rise of the national priesthood. They are mentioned prior to the theophany on Sinai (Ex. xix. 22, 24). Aaron is called "the Levite" (that is "the priest") as early as Ex. iv. 14. According to the most ancient tradition it was Moses who, above all, promulgated in priestly fashion from the oracular tent the decrees of God (Ex. xxxiii. 7 sqq.) and the divine legislation (Ex. xviii. 15 sqq.). He is regarded as the founder of the priesthood. The only two priestly clans which come into notice during the period of the judges go back to the family of Moses (cf. for Dan, Judges xviii. 30; and for Shiloh, I Sam. ii. 27–28, according to which God revealed himself in Egypt to the house of Eli and entrusted it with the priesthood). The form of Aaron rises in the old tradition and can not be otherwise disposed of. It is a capricious proceeding to interpret him as a mere personification of the ark of the covenant by a play on the word *aron* "ark" (E. Renan, *Histoire du peuple d'Israel*, i. 179, 5 vols., Paris, 1887–94; Eng. transl., *Hist. of the People of Israel*, London, 1888 sqq.). It is conceivable that the house of Eli originated with Moses, while the Zadokites were derived from Aaron. It is, however, more probable that the house of Eli went back to Aaron, through one of their ancestors, Phinehas, and lost first place in the genealogy when the legitimacy and higher dignity of the "sons of Zadok" were established as being of great antiquity.

1. Origin.

The descendants of Eli retained their priestly office despite the loss of the ark (I Sam. iv. 11 sqq.) and the destruction of Shiloh that ensued probably at that time (Jer. vii. 12, 14). In the time of Saul, Ahia-Ahimelech, grandson of Phinehas, and son of Ahitub, was priest, carried the ephod, and inquired of Yahweh for Saul (I Sam. xiv. 3 sqq.). Nob is mentioned as the home of the sons of Eli who had increased to the number of eighty-five. After the massacre by Saul, the only survivor, Abiathar, fled to David and became his priest (I Sam. xxii). The ark on its return was placed in the house of Abinadab in Kirjath-Jearim and his son, Eleasar, was ordained its guardian (I Sam. vii. 1). Uzza and Ahio are mentioned later as sons of Abinadab (II Sam. vi. 3). The ark having been placed in Jerusalem by David, the priestly service in connection with it continued, and Abiathar and Zadok appear regularly as priests. The sons of David and the Jairite Ira are also referred to as priests (II Sam. viii. 18, xx. 26). David himself on occasion wore the priestly ephod, presented the sacrifice and blessed the people in the name of Yahweh (II Sam. vi. 14, 18, xxiv. 25). The partizanship of Abiathar for Adonijah led to his banishment to Anathoth, and it is possible that Jeremiah "the son of Hilkiah, of the priests of Anathoth" (Jer. i. 1) belonged to this family. Zadok's son Azariah is mentioned as the chief of the royal officials (I Kings iv. 2).

2. To the Division of the Kingdom.

Jeroboam, after the division of the kingdom, established an official worship at Bethel and Dan for the northern kingdom with priests who "did not belong to the Levites" (I Kings xii. 31–32, xiii. 33). As royal officials they shared the fate of the

dynasty when it fell. After the deportations of 722, 720, and later, the replanted colony asked for priests of Yahweh to conduct the service of the national religion (II Kings xvii. 26 sqq.). Amos (vii. 10 sqq.) and Hosea (iv. 4–14, vi. 9) give unflattering pictures of the priests of the north. In the southern kingdom Jehoshaphat is said to have appointed priests as judges in Jerusalem and throughout the country (II Chron. xvii. 8, xix. 8–11). The priesthood supported the dynasty of David in the time of Athaliah and defended the religion of Yahweh against the Phenician Baal worship. The degeneracy of the Jewish priesthood is described by Isaiah and Micah, but on the discovery of the book of the law (622 B.C.; cf. E. Naville, *The Discovery of the Book of the Law*, London, 1910) the priesthood cooperated with the king in carrying out its provisions (II Kings xxii.–xxiii.). The reform of Josiah abolished idolatry and the worship on the high places, and raised the position of the priesthood of the capital. Jeremiah (viii. 8) has priests in mind when, among other complaints, he declares that the scribes turn the law into lies. The priests were, next to the false prophets, Jeremiah's principal opponents.

3. The Regal Period.

Many priests must have returned after the exile (Ezra viii. 2, 24). In the first years after the exile the priests seem to have sunk to a low spiritual and moral level (Zeph. iii. 4; Mal. i. 6–ii. 9), and were among those who intermarried with the heathen. Twenty-one of these, with the Levites and heads of the people, signed the covenant of Neh. ix. (Neh. x. 3–9). The incomes of the priests and the order of the temple service were regulated at that time. Nehemiah energetically suppressed, during his second stay in Jerusalem, renewed attempts of the priests to form alliances with the surrounding peoples and to grant them rights in the temple (Neh. xiii. 4–9, 28–31), a measure which led to the establishment of the Samaritan congregation (Neh. xiii. 28; Josephus, *Ant.*, XI., vii. 2, viii. 2 sqq.). The high priest and his house steadily gained in importance, and the scribes, as interpreters of the law, acquired the real spiritual leadership of the people (see High Priest; Pharisees and Sadducees). Priests abandoned the service of the altar during the Hellenistic period (see Hellenism), to view the gymnastic exercises (II Mac. iv. 14). On the other hand, the Maccabees (see Hasmoneans) came of a priestly family. As a consequence of the Maccabean victory the old high-priestly aristocracy was compelled to retire, but found in the newly established temple of Leontopolis (q.v.) in Egypt an opportunity for priestly activity. The high regard in which the priesthood was held by the pious in this and the subsequent period may be inferred from the Book of Jubilees and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (see Pseudepigrapha, IV., 33, III. 23) in their glorification of Levi. John the Baptist was the son of a priest (Luke i. 5 sqq.), and Josephus came of a priestly family.

4. Exile to New-Testament Times.

3. Organization: The historical data concerning the organization of the priesthood are scanty. It is probable that there were higher and lower grades of temple attendants from the beginning. The Canaanites were probably employed in menial services about the sanctuary (Josephus, *Ant.*, IX., xxi. sqq.). Foreigners served in the temple up to the time of the exile, and formed racial associations and are called *nethinim*, "gifts," in the lists of the returned exiles. Toward the close of the regal period there was at the head of the Jerusalem priesthood a "high priest" and a "chief priest," and three doorkeepers (II Kings xxiii. 4, xxv. 18). All this is independent of the question of the relative rank of priests and Levites, which had become acute under the reform of Josiah. Deuteronomy distinguishes between regular priests in service and the solitary Levite in a country town, who occupied the position of a *ger* ("stranger," q.v.; see also Proselyte) and depended upon charity for his subsistence. The Levite had the right to act as priest at the central sanctuary, but it is uncertain what rank he would take there and whether he might remain permanently or must return to his home. This was a question which did not interest the Deuteronomist. During the exile, Ezekiel drafted his proposals for the reorganization of the temple service, among which was that the priests who had served idols on the high places were as a punishment to do the work formerly performed by the foreigners in the temple (Ezek. xliv. 10 sqq.). His program did not create the distinction between superior and inferior temple attendants, or between the aristocratic Zadokites and the humbler Levites of the country; but he established the terminology, and "Levites" was thenceforward the designation of the subordinate temple attendants. Developments, however, did not follow Ezekiel's ideals. The lists of the returned exiles show that those who could not give evidence of priestly descent were excluded from the temple service, that not a few must have attained the priesthood from families outside Jerusalem, and that the distinction between priests and Levites had been established in Palestine as well as in Babylonia. In the priest code the Levites take a prominent position, but are subordinate to the priests. Theoretically they are the substitutes for the whole community in place of the first-born that belonged to Yahweh and as such are "given" to the priests (Num. iii. 9, viii. 19, xviii. 6). The older opposition between the priestly tribe of Levi and the other tribes appears in P, especially in Num. xvi.–xvii. The proportion of priests and Levites given in P, one to 11,000, at no time corresponded in the remotest degree with the facts. P is the representation of an ideal theocracy such as was supposed actually to have existed in the time of Moses. Ezra's reform sought to realize a holy community in accordance with the ideas expressed in P.

1. Ranks and Grades.

A more elaborate distribution of the priests into classes gradually arose out of the preexilic organization into families. There were four classes or families on the return from the exile, those of Joshua (the high-priestly family), Immer, Pashur, and Harim (Ezra ii. 36–39). There was an attempt to connect the post-exilic with the preexilic families. According to rabbinical tradition the

four classes were divided by lot into twenty-four. The people, too, are said to have been divided into twenty-four classes, each of which sent representatives for a week to assist at the sacrifices in Jerusalem. (*Taanith*, iv. 2 sqq.). But how far these arrangements were carried out is doubtful. The size of some of the classes made subdivisions necessary. The hierarchical order of the latest period was essentially as follows: (1) The high priest; (2) the captain of the temple (Acts iv. 1, v. 24), subordinates of whom are also mentioned. (3) two *katholikin*, probably overseers of the temple property; (4) several *gizborim*, "stewards"; (5) a number of *amarkelin*, probably guardians of the treasure. The twenty-four heads of courses and of families are in a separate category. A *merubheh begadhim*, or high priest ordained by investiture instead of by anointment, is added in some places.

2. Post-Exilic Arrangements.

4. Position and Duties: The priesthood in Israel was held in high respect, although it never had the importance of the hierarchy in Egypt or Babylonia. It was a sin to kill a priest even at the express command of a king (I Sam. xxii. 17; I Kings ii. 26). But excepting perhaps the house of Eli at Shiloh in the preexilic period the priests were in a state of dependence on private individuals (Judges xvii. 10 sqq.), tribes (Jude xviii. 19), or especially on the kings. Twice the Jerusalem priesthood interfered in politics (I Kings i.; II Kings xi.), but never dared to disregard the royal arrangements for the temple. The position of priests in the community is in no way to be compared with that of the prophets. They lacked organization and after the exile had little influence. Indeed, they were often opposed by the pious among the people, even before the times when Hellenism was influential. The law which gave them an important place in the post-exilic theocracy prevented their historical development, since the ideal which the law was intended to establish was past and fixed. The function of the priesthood according to the law was to mediate between God and the people. It received for God the sacrifices of the people; it imparted God's blessing to the people. In the ancient period the chief duty of the priests was to learn the divine will or *torah* by means of the sacred lot (see Ephod; Lot; and Urim and Thummim). The *torah* included decisions on doubtful legal points, answers to questions of a ritualistic and ceremonial nature or those asked in important crises. The customary law that arose from the priest code shows that the old Israelitic *torah* was pervaded by an earnest moral spirit.

1. Teaching Functions.

In the more ancient period the assistance of the priests at sacrifice was not required (see Sacrifice), only later did the services of priests at the sacrifices become customary, and, finally, mercenary. The duties of the priest at the sacrifice may be learned from the priest code, where ancient custom and later practise are described together. The sacrificial animal was slaughtered by him who brought the sacrifice, both in the early period and according to P Ezekiel would assign the work to the Levites (Ezek. xliv. 11); according to the Chronicles (II Chron. xxx. 16, xxxv. 11) they took part only at great festivals as assistants of the priests. The priests themselves in later times acted as slaughterers at ordinary sacrifices (II Chron. xxix. 24, 34). The priests removed the ashes, maintained the fire, took care of tabernacle, temple furnishings, and appurtenances (Lev. vi. 2 sqq., xxiv. 8; Ex. xxvii. 21, xxx. 7–8; Num. iv. 8 sqq.). It was their duty to examine those who were obliged to remove from the camp and to bring the sacrifice of purification for them (Lev. xiii.–xiv.), to deal with the woman suspected of adultery, to reconsecrate the Nazarite whose oath had been violated, and at the close of the consecration period to bring the sacrifice (Num. vi. 9–20), to present the ashes of purification of the red heifer (Num. xix. 3 sqq.). They were to estimate the value of the redeemable forfeits to the sanctuary, the value of the first-born, of inheritances, and of everything under the ban (Lev. xxvii. 7 sqq.), to pass upon ceremonial purity, to blow the holy trumpets, and finally to bless the people (Lev. x. 10–11; Num. x. 8–10, vi. 23–27). The priest code does not deal with the right of the priests to pronounce judgment, whereas Ezekiel (xliv. 24) strongly emphasizes it, and Deuteronomy (in what is regarded as an interpolation) mentions it explicitly several times (Deut. xvii. 8 sqq., xix. 17). In post-exilic times the judicial function was exercised generally by the elders or the king. The priest issued only the divine judgment as expressed through the lot. In post-exilic times the judicial function was exercised by the aristocracy (Ezra vii. 25, x. 14). A centralized high court was gradually formed in the Sanhedrin (q.v.) in which priests sat. Deuteronomy discusses the duties of the priesthood briefly.

2. Sacrificial and Other Functions.

5. Consecration, Manner of Life: The priesthood in ancient Israel passed, as a rule, by inheritance, although sometimes those not of priestly families were consecrated. Even those of priestly family were obliged to pass through a solemn ordination ceremonial (Ex. xxix. 1–37, xl. 12–15; Lev. viii.), consisting of: (1) an act of purification and atonement. The priest was washed and a sin-offering was brought for him. (2) An act of investiture and the bringing of a burnt-offering. (3) An act of consecration consisting of (a) anointing with oil, (b) the application of the blood of the ram to the lobe of the right ear, the right thumb, and right great-toe; part of the rest being sprinkled around the altar, and part of it left standing in a vessel upon the altar; (c) the sprinkling with blood and oil,—the remainder of the blood and oil being mixed and sprinkled on the person and dress of the priest. Following this threefold consecration came a third sacrificial act, the offering of the ram of consecration, with the accompanying division of the flesh among those whose perquisite it was. The entire proceeding represents the transference to the priest of the authority of presenting the sacrifice to God and of receiving in its place the priestly portion.

1. Consecration.

The ordinary priest was required to wear during the performance of his duties: (1) linen trousers that reached from the hips to the ankles; (2) a

long tunic provided with arms of byssus in one piece, woven probably in a checker pattern; (3) a girdle also of byssus, inwoven with threads of blue, purple, and scarlet. According to Josephus (*Ant.*, III., vii. 2) there were inwoven flowers, and the ends of the girdle hung down to the ground, being thrown over the left shoulder during the service; (4) a sort of cap, also of byssus, of uncertain form; a conical shape is usually assumed. The color of the dress, excepting the girdle, was white throughout, symbolizing purity. No shoes were worn. The hereditary priests were under all circumstances assured of support from the legally provided income; but actual priestly service was permitted only to the physically faultless. In Lev. xxi. 17–20, are enumerated twelve blemishes that disqualify a priest for officiating. Priestly ordination must therefore have been preceded by a thorough examination. Those who passed it clothed themselves in white; those who failed, in black (Middoth v. 4). No age limits are given in the codes, but traditionally the minimum age was twenty.

2. Apparel; Manner of Life.

The rules for purification laid down for the people in general were more strict as applied to the priests. They were not to arouse the suspicion of adherence to other divinities by any peculiarities in method of wearing the hair or by using heathen rites of mourning, were to avoid defilement from the dead, excepting for father, mother, son, daughter, brother, unmarried sister, and wife. The priest's marriage was restricted in certain respects—he might not marry a woman of immoral character, a sickly or a divorced woman, or a widow, unless perhaps her former husband had been a priest. Adultery by a priest's daughter was punishable with death by fire. Especial strictness in observing the rules of purification was required during the period of actual service—perfect continence, abstinence from wine, and washing before the beginning of the service, and the sacred dress was not to be worn at any other time (Lev. x.; Ezek. xliv. 17 sqq., xxiv. 44).

6. Perquisites: The income of the priest consisted of his portion from sacrifices, other religious assessments, and income from private sources. The priest who officiated at a sacrifice received a share of the common sacrificial meal (I Sam. ii. 13 sqq.). The consecrated bread usually fell to him (I Sam. xxi. 5, 7); and to him, in general, everything fell that had once been hallowed and excluded from profane use, in so far as it was not eaten at the common sacrificial meal, or, because of high sanctity, destroyed. In the period of the kings the priests received money given as trespass and sin-offerings (II Kings xii. 16). According to D the tribe of Levi received all the burnt-offerings of Yahweh (Deut. xxiii. 1). The intensification of ritualistic zeal, as witnessed by the prophets, redounded to the advantage of the priests. According to P the priest received the hide from the burnt-offering and all the sin and guilt offerings for individual Israelites. The sin and guilt-offerings brought for the people as a whole and for the high-priest were burned outside the camp (Ex. xxix. 14; Lev. iv. 21). Of all sacrifices such as peace offerings the priest received the breast and the right thigh, and a cake as a by-gift. Of the meat-offering he received all that was not east into the altar-fire as heave-offering; as also the showbread, the meat of lambs brought at Pentecost, and definite impost on the sacrifices of the Nazarites (Lev. vii. 31 sqq., ii. 3, 10; Num. vi. 20). All firstlings of the flocks were brought as solemn sacrifices to God and the priest received his share (Ex. xxii. 29). All that was unclean and unserviceable was to be redeemed, as also the first-born of men. Everything under the ban fell to the priests (Lev. xxvii. 21, 28; Num. xviii. 14). The first-fruits of grain, new wine, and oil belonged to Yahweh (Ex. xxiii. 19). The magnitude of the offering of first-fruits is not stated. According to Deut. xiv. 22 sqq., the custom seems to have been a tenth of the total produce every third year. In P the first-fruits includes that of the threshing-floor and new flour (dough; Num. xv. 17–21). In addition there were firstlings of fruit which were brought in baskets in solemn procession to the temple. According to Neh. x. 37–39, these offerings were stored up in the chambers of the temple. The priest received also firstlings at the feasts of unleavened bread and of Pentecost (Lev. xxiii. 10, 20).

The Tithe (q.v.), perhaps originally and even in D identical with the first-fruits, was to be eaten as a sacrificial meal at the central sanctuary (Deut. xiv. 22 sqq.). It might be converted into money but was to be used only in the form of a sacrificial meal, at which the Levite must not be forgotten. At the end of three years the whole tithe was to be made over to the poor of the locality, including again the Levite. In P the tithe is a fixed tribute to the Levites, who in turn have to give a tenth to the priests (Num. xviii. 21, 25 sqq., 30). This legislation was never carried out in practise. The high-priestly families, even under the régime of the law, monopolized the tithe, while the lower priests suffered privation (Josephus, *Ant.*, XX., viii. 8, ix. 2). The prescriptions of P and D were so combined by the pious Jew that he offered the tithe of Num. xviii. 21 as a "first tithe," that of Deut. xiv. 22–27 as a "second," and that of Deut. xiv. 28–29 as a "third" (Tob. i. 7–8; Josephus, *Ant.*, IV., viii. 22). A considerable part of the income of the priests was derived from ownership of real estate. Instances of individual priests owning land may be found in I Kings ii. 26; Jer. xxxii. 7 sqq., xxxvii. 12; Ezek. xlv. 1 sqq., xlviii. 10 sqq. Many priests as well as Levites in the first years after the exile must have supported themselves from the products of the land near Jerusalem. In Josh. xxi. and I Chron. vi. 39 sqq., thirteen of the forty-eight Levite cities, all lying near Jerusalem, are apportioned to the priests. The apportionment never actually took place, but the texts indicate how the subject was considered. (J. Köberle†.)

II. In the Christian Church: Offerings and priests are essential factors in all pre-Christian religions, the one as means of securing the divine favor, the other as mediators between suppliants and the deity by presenting the offerings of the former to the latter. It was a striking characteristic

of early Christianity that it had no offering, and therefore no priests. All the faithful were conceived as priests, and prayer as their offering; but, if all were priests, there was no room for a professional priesthood, and prayer can not be conceived as material. This idea of a congregation of priests (the universal priesthood, as it is called) was a favorite in the ancient Church, and was regarded as part of the superiority of Christianity (Justin Martyr, *Trypho*, cxvi.). Irenæus (*Hær.*, IV., viii. 3) uses it to justify his designation of the apostles as priests. Tertullian (*De exhortatione castitatis*, vii.) grounds upon it the right of all Christians to administer the sacraments (cf. *De baptismo*, xvii.; *De monogamia*, vii.). Origen (e.g., "On Prayer," xxviii. 9) and Augustine (*Civitas Dei*, xx. 10; Reuter in *ZKG*, vii. 209) know of it and approve it, and even Leo the Great mentions it (e.g., *Sermo*, iv. 1) with approbation. In time, however, another set of ideas supplanted that of the universal priesthood, and it became customary to name bishops and presbyters "priests" (*sacerdotes*). The designation was in use in Africa in Tertullian's time (cf. *De baptismo*, xvii.; *De exhortatione castitatis*, vii.) and it is found in Rome and the East in the third century. Comparison between the Christian officials and the Old-Testament priesthood was instituted as early as the end of the first century (cf. I Clement xl. sqq.); this may have led to giving the name of the latter to the former, but it is more likely that this conception was introduced by that of a Christian offering. As early as the *Didache* (cf. chap. xiv.) the elements of the eucharist were called "offerings." The usage at first was figurative, and the congregation, not the officials, were thought of as making the offering (cf. Justin, *Trypho*, cxvii.; *Apol.*, i. 67; Irenæus, *Hær.*, IV., xvii. 5, xviii. 1). But, the phraseology having come into use, it was inevitable that thought should progress. The conception of a Christian altar, the place of offering, grew up in the time when Christians were still declaring "we have no altar" (cf. Apostolic Constitutions, ii., vii.). From all this it was not far to the thought that bishops and presbyters are priests, not as Christians, because of the universal priesthood, but by virtue of their office; and the language of Tertullian (ut sup.) shows that the transition had been made. Old-Testament notions doubtless added their influence. In the third century the offerings were made not by but for the faithful, and the Christian priest had become the mediator between God and his servants. The figurative sense was remembered for a time beside the new interpretations, but ultimately was lost sight of. The letters of Cyprian in many passages present bishops, presbyters, and even deacons as "priests," who offer sacrifice to God and fill a mediatory office; they and not the congregation make the eucharistic offering, and it is assumed that Old-Testament passages are applicable to the Christian priests. The development of thought in the Greek Church was the same (cf. Apostolic Constitutions, II., xxv. 12, IV., xv. 1; the third of the Apostolic Canons; canons i. and ii. of the Synod of Ancyra, Mansi, *Collectio*, ii. 513; Synod of Laodicea, canon xix., Mansi, 567; Chrysostom, "On Priesthood," iii. 4, iv. 1, vi. 4, 11. Chrysostom's views of the priesthood are still held unchanged in the Eastern Church).

1. Early and Patristic Conceptions.

The mediæval Church accepted this conception without question. From it or in connection with it theologians (e.g., Peter Lombard; cf. the "Sentences," iv. dist. 24J) developed the doctrine of the sacrifice of the mass (see Mass, I). The authorities on church polity made it the basis of the exclusive right of the hierarchy and especially of the bishop of Rome to govern the Church. Thomas Aquinas remembered the universal priesthood; but he drew from it only the conclusion that all the faithful as priests bring spiritual offerings to God, not the inference that they have no need of human mediators (*Summa*, iii., quest. 82, art. 1; cf. iii. quest. 26, art. 1, Sup. iii. quest. 37, art. 2). If the mass was a sacrifice, the celebrant must be regarded as a priest in the fullest sense. So the universal priesthood was lost sight of until it was revived by the Reformation. Then it appeared as the necessary consequence of the very fact of Christianity. The entire conception of sacrifice was rejected, and with it went all danger of a return of the thoughts which had grown from it.

2. The Mediæval Church.

The Roman Church adheres to the mediæval doctrine. To be sure its catechism (*De ord. sacr.*, §§ 505–506, p. 613, ed. Danz) speaks of a twofold priesthood—an "inner" and an "outer," the former common to all, the latter the prerogative of a class set apart for their appropriate service. But how strongly the emphasis falls on the latter appears from the unreserved judgment of the Council of Trent (session xxiii., *De sacr. ord.*, chap. iv.): "If any one affirm that all Christians indiscriminately are priests of the New Testament or that they are all mutually endowed with an equal spiritual power, he clearly does nothing but confound the ecclesiastical hierarchy, which is an army set in array." The ecclesiastical priesthood follows from the New-Testament sacrifice, and the Scriptures and church tradition agree that it was instituted by the Lord and that its "power of consecrating, offering, and administering his body and blood, as also of forgiving and of retaining sins," was delivered to the apostles and their successors (l.c., chap. i.; cf. canon i.). The priestly order was always entered by means of an act of benediction, which was conceived as a sacrament as early as Augustine (*Contra epist. Parmeniani*, ii. 24, 28, 29). Peter Lombard ("Sentences," iv., dist. 24) repeats the thoughts of Augustine, and Thomas Aquinas (*Summa*, iii., Sup. quest. 34–40) develops them but slightly. The scholastic doctrine is summed up in the bull *Exultate Deo* of Eugenius IV On these old foundations the anti-Protestant doctrine is built up in the authoritative writings of the Roman Church. It is said: "As Christ was sent by the Father and the apostles by Christ, so to-day priests are sent, with the same power which clothed Christ and the apostles, for the perfection of the faithful and the upbuilding of the body of Christ. No one can assume this honor

3. The Roman Doctrine.

of himself, but he must be called of God; and those are called of God who are called by the "legitimate ministers of the Church" (Roman catechism, *De ord. sacr.*, l., p. 603). Ordination can be imparted only by the bishops. It is a sacrament, the effect of which is the ineffaceable spiritual character by virtue of which the priest has power to "make sacrifice to God and administer the sacraments of the Church" (l.c. 5, p. 614), especially to "produce the body and blood of our Lord." This character distinguishes the priest from other believers. The secondary effect is the reception of the "grace of justification," which enables the recipient to fill his office rightly (l.c., p. 618). The ceremony of ordination is made to conform to these ideas. The bishop and the priests present lay their hands on the candidate, the bishop puts the stole over his shoulders crossing it before his breast, anoints the candidate's hands, and then gives him the full cup and the paten with the host. The candidate thereby becomes an "interpreter and mediator between God and man, which is considered the chief function of the priest." Finally, there is another imposition of hands with the words: "Receive the Holy Spirit, whose soever sins ye remit," etc. (l.c., 5, p. 614). The candidate must be baptized and of the male sex, and is required to be morally sound. He must have knowledge of the Scriptures and the administration of the sacraments. Ordination is forbidden to the married, those not yet twenty-five years of age, slaves, all who have shed blood, those with serious bodily defects, and all born out of wedlock. In the ancient Church it was not allowed without induction at the same time into a suitable benefice, and the Council of Trent renewed this provision. The Council opened the way, however, to avoid the restriction by providing that, if the *titulus beneficii* be lacking, ordination may take place on ground of a *titulus patrimonii*, i.e., the possession by the candidate of adequate personal means. The *titulus mensæ*, i.e., assurance by another to provide for the candidate's support, may be substituted for the *titulus patrimonii*. (A. Hauck.)

4. Anglican Conception.

It is to be noted as an evidence of the determination to continue the ministry as it had come down through the ages from the primitive Church, that, while throwing off corruptions and exaggerations concerning the priestly office, the reformed Church of England deliberately refused to substitute "presbyter" for "priest" in the Book of Common Prayer, and retained *sacerdotes* as the designation of the clergy in the authorized Latin version of the Thirty-nine Articles (art. XXXII.). Controversy concerning priesthood chiefly gathers round two points: (1) the offering which priests present, (2) the mediatorial position which they occupy. (1) While repudiating any material sacrifice in the Christian Church (save in the most subordinate sense), or any renewal of our Lord's sacrificial death, Anglican divines have maintained in the eucharist a continual commemoration, according to Christ's institution, of that one perfect oblation, and the application of its virtue to us, as in the peace-offering, by partaking of the consecrated elements. Showing Christ's obedience unto death (the essence of his sacrifice), we are taught, according to St. Paul, to offer likewise ourselves, as members of his mystical body—our souls and bodies—a reasonable, holy, and living sacrifice to God. This is the sacrificial side of the Eucharist in the Anglican liturgy, and according to her representative divines. This is a priestly act of the whole body under Christ, the high priest of our profession, led by the Church's appointed representatives in the official priesthood. The priest acts not as substitute for the people, but as their leader. Without such a duly appointed leader there can be no celebration of the Eucharist; while he is not to perform the service without a congregation (cf. D. Waterland, *A Review of the Doctrines of the Eucharist*, chap. xii., in *Works*, vol. vii., 11 vols., Oxford, 1823–28; J. Bramhall, *Consecration of Protestant Bishops Vindicated*, chap. xi., and *Protestants' Ordination Defended*, in vols. iii. and v. of his *Works*, 5 vols., Oxford, 1842–45; *Answer of the Archbishops of England to the Apostolic Letter of Pope Leo XIII. on English Ordinations*, pp. 18, 19, 37, London, 1897). (2) The priesthood is not a caste separate or separable from the Church; it is the divinely ordained organ through which the body executes ministerial functions. In public prayer as in the Eucharist the priest is the leader of the congregation. In private ministrations likewise, it is his office to lead persons to God, aiding them, where need requires, in their penitence and confession, and then, as one authorized to plead in the Church's name, invoking upon them God's blessing, or (where he judges it to be applicable) his absolution.

Thus in the ministration of the sacraments the priest acts as the representative of the Church, as well as of the Lord the head of the Church. Sacraments are an approach in an appointed way to God. Their administration is always accompanied by prayer, calling forth the gift that God has promised.

The Anglican conception of the office of priesthood is clearly shown in the ordinal. (1) No one is suffered to act as a priest without ordination by a bishop, through whom the ministerial commission is transmitted. (2) In this ordination the Holy Ghost is solemnly invoked, and prayers are offered for the candidate, and he is then by the imposition of hands empowered to execute the office of a priest in the Church of God, and is bidden to be a faithful dispenser of the Word of God and of his holy sacraments. A. C. A. Hall.

Bibliography: On I.: A fairly good guide to the literature is indicated in the bibliographies under High Priest; and Levi, Levites, the reference in which to the literature on the Hexateuch is important; of especial value are the works of Kuenen, Curtiss, Green, Baudissin, Van Hoonacker, Carpenter and Harford-Battersby, Schürer, and the articles in the Bible dictionaries there mentioned, to which add Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire*, part xxxii., cols. 640–660. The subject is treated in the works on Jewish antiquities—Ewald, Germ., pp. 345 sqq., 3d ed., Göttingen, 1866, Eng. transl., pp. 260 sqq., Boston, 1876; Benzinger, *Archäologie*, pp. 342 sqq.; and Nowack, *Archäologie*, vol. ii. Consult further: K. C. W. F. Bähr, *Symbolik des mosaischen Cultus*, Heidelberg, 1839; Küper, *Das Priestertum des alten Bundes*, Berlin, 1866; Oort, in *ThT*, 1884, 289 sqq.; H. Vogelstein, *Der Kampf zwischen Priestern und Leviten seit den Tagen des Ezechiels*, Stettin, 1889; B. Bäntsch, *Das Heiligkeitsgesetz*, pp. 142 sqq., Erfurt, 1893; A. Büchler, *Die Priester und der Cultus im letzten Jahrzehnt des jerusalemischen Tempels*, Vienna,

1895; E. Meyer, *Entstehung des Judentums*, pp. 168 sqq., Halle, 1896; F. von Hummelauer, *Das vormosaische Priestertum in Israel*, Freiburg, 1899; A. Edersheim, *The Temple; its Ministry and Services at the Time of Jesus Christ*, London, 1900; W. Kelly, *The Priesthood. An Exposition of Lev. viii.–xv.*, ib. 1902; W. Rosenau, *Jewish Ceremonial Institutions and Customs*, Baltimore, 1903; W. R. Harper, *Constructive Studies in the Priestly Element in the O. T.*, 2d ed., Chicago, 1905; G. Laudtman, *The Origin of Priesthood*, Ekenas, 1905; C. F. Kent, *Student's Old Testament*, vol. iv., New York, 1907.

For the idea of the priesthood in the Christian Church consult: Chrysostom's "Six Books on the Priesthood," in Eng. transl. in *NPNF*, 1 ser., ix. 33–83, and also translated by B. H. Cowper, London, 1866; Bingham, *Origines*, i. 72 sqq., 219 sqq.; Sermon on the Keys in the *Catechism Set forth by Archbishop Cranmer*, 1548; R. Hooker, *Ecclesiastical Polity*, V., lxxvii. 1–8, in *Works*, 3 vols., Oxford, 1841; W. Howitt, *Hist. of Priestcraft*, London, new ed., 1846; G. Hickes, *Treatises on Christian Priesthood*, republished in *Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology*, 3 vols., Oxford, 1847–48; T. T. Carter, *The Doctrine of the Priesthood of the Church of England*, London, new ed., 1863; E. Mellor, *Priesthood in the Light of the New Testament*, ib. 1876 (Congregational Lecture); H. E. Manning, *The Eternal Priesthood*, ib. 1883; H. C. Lea, *A Sketch of Sacerdotal Celibacy*, Boston, 1884; Sacerdoce (pseudonym), *The Ancient Fathers on the Priesthood in the Church*, London, 1891; E. Denney, *Anglican Orders and Jurisdiction*, New York, 1894; N. Dimock, *The Christian Doctrine o Sacerdotium*, London, 1897, memorial ed., 1910; R. C. Moberly, *Ministerial Priesthood*, chap. vii., ib. 1897; C. Gore, *The Church and the Ministry*, ib. 1899; W. Sanday, *The Conception of Priesthood in the Early Church and in the Church of England*, ib. 1899; idem, *Different Conceptions of Priesthood and Sacrifice*, ib. 1900; R. Poncet, *Les Privilèges des clercs au moyen-âge*, Paris, 1901; J. Wordsworth, *The Ministry of Grace. Studies in Early Church History*, London, 1901; T. M. Lindsay, *The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries*, ib. 1902; the Encyclical of Leo XIII. on Anglican Orders is in Eng. transl. in *The Great Encyclical Orders of Pope Leo XIII., with Preface by J. J. Wynne*, New York, 1903; H. Bruders, *Die Verfassung der Kirche von dem ersten Jahrhundert*, Mainz, 1904; H. Evans, *The Price of Priestcraft*, London, 1904; C. Androutsos, *The Validity of English Ordinations from an Orthodox Catholic Point of View*, ib., 1910; Schaff, *Christian Church*, ii. 123–131, iii. 238 sqq., *DCA*, ii. 1698–1708.

PRIESTLEY, JOSEPH: English theologian and scientist; b. at Fieldhead in the parish of Birstall (28 m. s.w. of York), West Riding of Yorkshire, Mar. 13, 1733; d. at Northumberland, Pa., Feb. 6, 1804. He was the son of a cloth-weaver, and was brought up in the dissenting family of his aunt after 1742. Intended for the dissenting ministry, he mastered Latin and Greek at Batley grammar-school (1745), learned Hebrew under a Congregational clergyman, and studied also the rudiments of Chaldee, Syriac, and Arabic. His theological studies were interrupted by symptoms of tuberculosis, but were resumed in 1756 at Daventry Academy. Repelled by Calvinistic doctrine he embraced Arianism (q.v.) in distress that he could not feel a proper repentance for the sin of Adam. He became acquainted with David Hartley's *Observations on Man*, a book which exercised a decisive influence on his speculations, which also was ranked by him next to the Bible. He embraced Hartley's theory of association carrying with it the necessarian doctrine and in 1754 became a scientific determinist. In 1755 he became Presbyterian minister at Needham Market, Suffolk, but his success was impeded by an impediment in speech. He continued his theological studies and soon came to reject the doctrines of the atonement, the inspiration of the Bible, and all direct divine action on the human soul. In 1758 he became minister at Nantwich, Cheshire, and established a flourishing school, and in 1761 was appointed tutor in languages and belles-lettres at Warrington Academy. He was ordained in 1762; and removed to Mill Hill Chapel, Leeds, in 1767; became later a Socinian; in 1769 set on foot *The Theological Repository*, an organ of critical inquiry; and in 1773 entered the new religious movement under the Unitarian name (see UNITARIANS).

He then retired to Leeds, where he founded a circulating library and in 1773 removed to Calne, Wiltshire, as literary companion of the Earl of Sherbourne, which gave him leisure for study, during which his scientific experiments developed rapidly. *Disquisitions Relating to Matter and Spirit* (London, 1777), followed by *Philosophical Necessity* (1777), defined his position, which he called materialism. He had adopted the theory that matter consists only of points of force (1772); the doctrine of the penetrability of matter suggested itself before 1772; and after 1775 he had abandoned the distinction between soul and body for homogeneity. In 1780 he removed to Birmingham, where he was amply supplied by friends with funds for his living and for experiments, and the same year was made junior minister of the New Meeting. In his Greek *Harmony of the Gospels* (1777) he limited the ministry of Christ to a period of little more than a year; and his rejection of the doctrine of the virgin birth and of the impeccability and intellectual infallibility of Christ, and the opinion that he was born at Nazareth, were expressed in *The History of Early Opinions concerning Jesus Christ* (Birmingham, 1786). The best-known of his theological writings was *History of the Corruptions of Christianity* (1782). From 1786 Priestley issued an annual defense of Unitarianism and in 1791 concurred in the formation of the Unitarian Society. Supporting the principles of the French Revolution, he was one of the organizers of the Constitutional Society of Birmingham; and on the night of July 14, 1791, after the fall of the Bastile, a riotous mob burned his church and house with all his books, papers, and apparatus. He escaped by flight to London, and was partly indemnified after a legal contest covering nine years. He then settled down as morning preacher at Hackney, London, where he also continued his scientific pursuits and lectured on history and chemistry in Hackney College. He removed to the United States in 1794 and settled at Northumberland, Pa. There he held public services in his own house, and after 1799 in a wooden building, and succeeded in establishing a Unitarian society at Philadelphia. He worked out his doctrine of universal restitution, upheld Biblical institutions against those of oriental antiquity, annotated the whole Bible, and completed his *General History of the Christian Church* (Northumberland, 1802).

Priestley was a pioneer in the erection of chemistry into a science, in the investigation of gases, and the discovery of oxygen. He was a warm friend of Benjamin Franklin, whom he first met at London, after 1762. He was a member of the Royal Society from 1766 and was elected one of the eight associates of the French Academy of Sciences in 1772. He wrote a *History of the Present State of Electricity*

(London, 1769). He was an original seeker after truth, was essentially devout, and a rapid, untiring, and thought-educing writer. He stands at the transition point marked by the dissolution of ultra-theological views and the advent of agnosticism, occupying the central position of the first period of the Unitarian movement. Other works to be mentioned are: *Analogy of the Divine Dispensations* (*Theological Repository*, 1771) pronounced by James Martineau his finest piece of work; *A Free Discussion of the Doctrines of Materialism* (Birmingham, 1782); *Institutes of Natural and Revealed Religion* (1782); and *Letters to a Philosophical Unbeliever* (1787). *The Theological and Miscellaneous Works* (26 vols., London, 1817–32), and *Memoirs and Correspondence* (2 vols., 1831–32) were collected by J. T. Rutt, and name over 130 separate works.

Bibliography: His own *Memoirs* was edited and completed by his son Joseph, London, 1805, reprinted, 1904, best ed. by T. Cooper and W. Christie, 2 vols., London, 1806; *Priestley's Scientific Correspondence*, ed. H. C. Bolton, was privately printed, with biographical sketch and bibliographical notes, Brooklyn, 1893. As a source for his life the sketch in the *Universal Theological Magazine* for Apr., 1804, is essential. Consult further, besides the work of J. T. Rutt, ut sup.: J. Corry, *The Life of Joseph Priestley* (2 eds.), Birmingham, 1804; T. Belsham, *Zeal and Fortitude in the Christian Ministry Illustrated*, London, 1804; G. L. Cuvier, *Éloges historiques*, Paris, 1860; W. Sprague, *Annals of the American Unitarian Pulpit*, pp. 298–308, New York, 1865; Lord Brougham, in *Works*, vol. i., Edinburgh, 1872; F. Hitchman, *Eighteenth Century Studies*, London, 1881; Leslie Stephen, *Hist. of English Thought in the 18th Century*, New York, 1881; B. Schoenlank, *Hartley und Priestley die Begründer des Associationismus in England*, Halle, 1882; H. Sidgwick, *Hist. of Ethics*, London, 1886; T. E. Thorpe, *Joseph Priestley*, London and New York, 1906. Sidelights are cast by Miss C. Hutton, *Reminiscences of a Gentlewoman of the Last Century*, Birmingham, 1891; J. B. Daly, *The Dawn of Radicalism*, New York, 1892; J. H. Allen, in *American Church History Series*, x. 154–159, 187, New York, 1894; I. W. Riley, *American Philosophy*, The Early Schools, pp. 396–407, New York, 1907; *DNB*, xlvi. 357–376 (extended, with a very full account of his literary works and a useful index of references to letters published in various places and also to books containing scattering details).

PRIESTS OF THE MISSION. See Vincent de Paul.

PRIMACY. See Primate.

PRIMASIUS: Bishop of Hadrumetum and primate of Byzacena in Africa; d. about 560. Of his early life nothing seems to be known, but in 551, after he had become a bishop, he was called with other bishops to Constantinople and took part in the Three Chapters Controversy (q.v.) where he shared the fortunes of Vigilius, bishop of Rome; helped to condemn Theodorus Ascidas, bishop of Cæsarea, the chief promoter of the controversy, and fled with Vigilius to Chalcedon. He declined to attend the so-called fifth ecumenical council at Constantinople in the absence of the pope; was the sole African to sign the papal *constitutum* to Justinian, and was ingloriously crushed with his leader. While at Constantinople, Primasius studied the exegesis of the Greeks, and his fame is chiefly due to his commentary on the Apocalypse. This work, divided into five books (*MPL*, lxviii. 793–936), is of importance both as containing the pre-Cyprian Latin text of the Apocalypse of the early African church, and as aiding in the reconstruction of the most influential Latin commentary on the Apocalypse, the exegetical work of the Donatist Ticonius (q.v.; see also Autpertus, Ambrosius). The text and exegesis of Revelation xx. 1–xxi. 5 are taken without reference from Augustine's *De civitate Dei*, xx. 7–17. Of special interest is a letter of Augustine to the physician Maximus of Thenæ preserved by Primasius, in which the four philosophical cardinal virtues are combined with the later three so-called theological virtues to make the number seven, in a manner nowhere else known of Augustine. The work of the Donatist Ticonius was considered by Primasius a piece of treasure adrift and belonging of right to the Church, needing only to be revised and expurgated. He followed essentially the strongly spiritual exegetical method of Ticonius, approved the theory introduced by Victorinus and developed by Ticonius that the Apocalypse in certain places repeats with different words and imagery what had previously been said, and held the true content of the prophecy to be the conflict between the Church and the world instead of Ticonius' more concrete interpretation of the struggle of the Donatists with false brethren and gentiles. The first edition of Primasius' commentary was by Eucharius Cervicornus (Cologne, 1535; reprinted, Paris, 1544), but the most complete and still the most valuable is that of Basel, 1544, which is based on a very ancient manuscript of the Benedictine Monastery of Murbach in Upper Alsace. The same monastery, according to a manuscript catalogue, possessed a work *Contra hæreticos*, which is no longer extant, and alludes to other works, especially one on Jeroboam. The commentary on the Pauline epistles and on Hebrews ascribed to Primasius by Migne (*MPL*, lxviii. 409–793) is spurious. (J. Haussleiter.)

Bibliography: H. Kihn, *Theodor von Mopsuestia und Junilius Africanus als Exegeten*, pp. 248–254, Freiburg, 1880; J. Haussleiter, in *ZKW*. vii (1886), 239–257; idem, in T. Zahn's *Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, iv. 1–224, Leipsic, 1891; H. Zimmer, *Pelagius in Irland*, Berlin, 1901; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, xi. 283–284, x. 332, xi. 879; *DNB*, iv. 467.

PRIMATE: In general ecclesiastical usage, the chief prelate of a land or of a people. The early hierarchic organization followed the political division of the Roman Empire, but the terms applied to the higher officials of the Church changed in the course of time. In the East the system was headed by patriarchs, under whom were exarchs in the dioceses (in the Greek sense of the word) and eparchs in the provinces or eparchies. In the West this order finds its counterpart in the relation of the pope, the primates, and the archbishops. The designations *primas*, *episcopus primæ sedis*, or *episcopus primæ cathedræ* were originally synonymous with metropolitan, and occur after the beginning of the fourth century. *Episcopus primæ cathedræ* was applied to Secundus of Tigisis in the synodal acts of Certa (305), and occurs in canon 58, Synod of Elvira (306). The mode of speech is used with reference to Africa, Italy, and Gaul in the fifth and sixth centuries. The bishop of Carthage, however, had a different position from the other primates, since he exercised supervision over all the churches

of the African provinces; called and presided over the African general synods; and he could ordain anywhere. On the other hand, he had no special name, being termed merely *primas* or *senex*. His position accordingly corresponded to that of an oriental patriarch, but had no parallel in the West. The appellation " primate " gradually gave place to the title of archbishop, which was given to all metropolitans. It was reserved for those metropolitans who were also papal vicars. In the Pseudo-Isidore (see PSEUDO-ISIDORIAN DECRETALS) there is a marked tendency to deny the rank of primate to metropolitans. It was considered synonymous with patriarch (Anacletus, *Epist.*, ii. 26); and was accordingly restricted to the ancient primates, or to those whom the Curia, beginning with Nicholas I., desired to honor with that special title, thus leading to the practise of appointing primates in various countries to increase papal influence.

The bishops of Rome claimed the highest primacy in the Church, but, while accepting the pseudo-Isidorian identification of primate and patriarch, they were inclined to give larger prerogatives to the four ancient patriarchs than to the other primates; as, for instance, Innocent III. in view of the reunion of the Eastern Church with the Western. After the attempt had failed, however, the primates appointed by Rome took second place in the hierarchy, after the patriarchs. Their powers, partly determined by the older canons, partly by usage, and partly by special papal privileges, included the confirmation of the bishops and archbishops of their jurisdictions; the calling and conducting of national synods; the supervision of their territories; the court of higher appeal; and the right of royal coronation. At the present time, the primates possess little more than certain honorary privileges. The title of primate is now borne by the archbishops of Salzburg, Antivari, Salerno, Gnesen, Tarragona, Grau, Mechlin, Armagh, Braga, and Bahia in the Roman Catholic Church.

(A. HAUCK.)

In the Anglican Church the archbishop of Canterbury is primate of All England; the archbishop of York, primate of England; the archbishop of Sydney, primate of Australia; since 1893 the archbishop of the West Indies is primate for that territory; the Episcopal Church of Scotland has a primus; the archbishop of Toronto is primate of All Canada. In the Church of Ireland the archbishop of Armagh was primate of All Ireland, and the archbishop of Dublin was primate of Ireland.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: For the history and the sources consult Bingham, *Origines*, II., xvi. References to other early literature are in Hauck-Herzog, *RE*, xvi. 53. Consult further: G. Phillips, *Kirchenrecht*, ii. 68, Regensburg, 1846; P. Hinschius, *Kirchenrecht*, i. 581 sqq., Berlin, 1869; *DCA*, ii. 1708–09.

PRIME: The first of the so-called " little hours " of the Breviary (q.v.). According to Cassian (*De institutis cœnobiorum*, iii. 4 sqq.), it originated at the end of the fourth century in a monastery at Bethlehem, to fill the space between lauds, which closed the night office, and terce The name prime occurs first in the Rule of St. Benedict (chap. xv.). Prime and compline have special reference to the beginning and ending of the day and its work, and are less affected by the season or feast than the other hours, not even including the collect for the day. The first part of prime resembles the other " little hours " in structure; the psalms are three on feast-days, on Sundays four with the Athanasian Creed. The second part begins with the reading of the section of the martyrology (where this is read), and in monastic communities is recited not in choir but in the chapter-house. This original division is still indicated in the Roman breviary by the short lesson *ad absolutionem capituli* (" on leaving the chapter ") which closes the office.

PRIME, SAMUEL IRENÆUS: Presbyterian; b. at Ballston, N. Y., Nov. 4, 1812; d. at Manchester, Vt., July 15, 1885. He was graduated from Williams College (1829), and studied theology at Princeton Theological Seminary (1832–33). He took charge of the academy at Weston and was pastor at Ballston Spa (1833–35), and at Matteawan, N. J. (1837–40). He became editor of *The New York Observer* in 1840, and continued to occupy this position till his death, making it one of the most influential religious and family papers in the United States. He was for some time a director of the American Bible Society, corresponding secretary of the Evangelical Alliance, president of Wells College, and a trustee of Williams College. He took a leading part in the affairs of the Presbyterian Church, and in the Christian and philanthropic enterprises of the age. He wrote a number of books which had a large circulation abroad. Among them were the *Irenæus Letters* which appeared in the columns of *The New York Observer*, and show a rare faculty of clothing everyday topics and experiences with a fresh interest, and extracting from them lessons of practical wisdom.

With the Evangelical Alliance of America, founded in 1867 (see EVANGELICAL ALLIANCE, § 2), he was closely identified. He attended the fifth general conference at Amsterdam in 1867, and read the report on religion in America, prepared by Prof. Henry B. Smith. He served as one of the corresponding secretaries of the American Alliance till 1884, and had a prominent share in the preparations for the great New York Conference of 1873. Dr. Prime was a conservative in his theology, a man of sound judgment, quick wit, rich humor, and a ready incisive pen. He was one of the leaders of public opinion, and one of the most untiring and useful writers of his age and country. A memorial service in his honor was held by the Evangelical Alliance Jan. 5, 1886.

The following works issued from his pen: *The Old White Meeting-house, or Reminiscences of a Country Congregation* (New York, 1845); *Life in New York* (1845); *Annals of the English Bible, Abridged from Anderson, and Continued to the Present Time* (1849); *Thoughts on the Death of Little Children* (1850); *Travels in Europe and the East* (1855); *Power of Prayer* (history of the Fulton Street prayer-meeting, New York City; 1859); *The Bible in the Levant; or, the Life and Letters of the Rev. C. N. Righter, Agent of the American Bible Society in the Levant* (1859); *Letters from Switzerland* (1860); *Memoirs of the Rev. Nicholas Murray, D.D.* (Boston, 1862); *Five Years of Prayer* (in the Fulton Street prayer-meeting) *with the Answers* (New York, 1864); *Walking with God, Life hid with Christ* (1872); *Songs*

of the Soul, gathered out of many Lands and Ages (1873); *Alhambra and the Kremlin, Journey from Madrid to Moscow* (1873); *Fifteen Years of Prayer in the Fulton-street Prayer-meeting* (1873); *Under the Trees* (1874); *Life of Samuel F. B. Morse* (1875); *Prayer and its Answer illustrated in the first Twenty-five Years of the Fulton-street Prayer-meeting* (1882); *Irenæus Letters* (3 series, 1882; with portrait, 1885; *with sketch of Dr. Prime's life*, 1886, containing his autobiography in the form of letters).

P. and D. S. SCHAFF.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: W. Prime, *S. I. Prime. Autobiography and Memorials*, New York, 1888.

PRIMER: Ecclesiastically, an elementary book upon the cardinal points of Christian belief; liturgically, the name given to a series of works which have an important place in the history of the Anglican Prayer Book (see COMMON PRAYER, BOOK OF). The earliest example of the liturgical primer (with which this article is principally concerned) was compiled about 1390. The first of consequence was that by William Marshall, *Prymer in Englysshe* (London, 1535), which contained expositions of the Apostles' Creed, Decalogue, Lord's Prayer, and Ave Maria, also the various offices and hours, seven penitential Psalms, the Dirige, and the Roman Commendations. The next of importance was the "Bishops' Book," *The Godly and Pious Institution of a Christian Man* (1537), authorized by the king, the two archbishops, and a number of other ecclesiastical authorities, and marking a great step in advance from Romanism to Anglicanism. Bishop Hilsey's *Manuall of Prayers, or the Prymer in Englyshe* (1539) furnished a basis for the system of lessons and for that of the epistles and gospels. A step further was taken by *The Prymer set forth by the King's Majesty* (1545, reprinted 1547), which included the Litany. In 1553 appeared the *Primer of Private Prayers*, which was used in making Queen Elizabeth's *First Primer* (1560); her second (1566) incorporated many changes. The last known was issued in 1571. The employment of these belongs to the history of the Prayer Book (see COMMON PRAYER, BOOK OF, § 1).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Consult the literature under COMMON PRAYER, BOOK OF, especially F. Procter and W. H. Frere, *A New History of the Book of Common Prayer*, chaps. i.–ii., London, 1905. The three primers (Marshall's, Hilsey's, and King Henry's of 1545) were reprinted in E. Burton's *Three Primers put forth in the Reign of Henry VIII.*, Oxford, 1834, 2d ed., 1848.

PRIMICERIUS: In the medieval Church an administrative church official of lesser rank. He was classed with the archdeacon and treasurer, and his duties included, according to Isidore of Seville (*Epist.*, i. 13), the supervision of the acolytes, exorcists, and psalmists; the furnishing of an example for the clergy in duties, morals, devotions, and zeal of perfection; the distribution of assignments to the clergy and the regulation of chanting and the bearing of candles at feasts; the giving of advice to the parish priests; and direction through the Ostiarii (q.v.) of the episcopal letters enjoining fasts. The office was in vogue everywhere in the West in the sixth and seventh centuries. Later with the introduction of the canonical order the office was attached to the chapter. The decretals of Gregory IX. (1227–41) placed the primicerius after the archdeacon, and made him the superior over the minor clergy with special supervision of the service in the choir, thus identifying him with the *præcentor* In many dioceses the primicerius discharged the functions of the *scholasticus* and was the head of the cathedral school. Later still a portion of his functions were transferred to the dean, while special *præcentori* were frequently retained in the chapters. A peculiar development of the primicerius took place at Rome, where the office occurs possibly as early as the fourth century, and where almost a complete list of the *primicerii notariorum* from 544 to 1297 has been preserved (P. L. Galetti, *Del primicero della Santa Sede Apostolica*, pp. 20 sqq., Rome, 1776). This *primicerius notariorum* belonged to the lower clergy and had charge of parochial correspondence, of the martyrology, and the like; and after Gregory the Great (590–604) he was the scribe of papal documents. He thus became the chancellor and director of the papal archives. By the seventh and eighth centuries he had risen to such importance, that he, together with the archdeacon and archpresbyter, acted as pope during a vacancy. Late in the tenth century he was the first of the seven papal judges palatine. With the end of the thirteenth century, however, the office seems to have disappeared. (A. HAUCK.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Bingham, *Origines*, II., xxi. 11, III., xiii. 5; *DCA*, ii. 1709–1710; G. Phillips, *Kirchenrecht*, vi. 343, Regensburg, 1864; P. Hinschius, *Kirchenrecht*, i. 380–381, Berlin, 1869; H. Breslau, *Handbuch der Urkundenlehre*, i. 157 sqq., Leipsic, 1889.

PRIMIN, SAINT. See PIRMIN.

PRIMITIVE ("HARDSHELL") BAPTISTS. See BAPTISTS, II., 4 (h).

PRIMITIVE METHODISTS. See METHODISTS, I., 4, IV 9.

PRINCE, THOMAS: Congregationalist; b. at Sandwich, Mass., May 15, 1687; d. in Boston Oct. 22, 1758. He was graduated at Harvard College, 1707; visited Barbados and Madeira; preached for several years at Coombs and other places in England; returned to Boston, 1717, and in 1718 was ordained associate pastor of the Old South Church, Boston. His memory rests upon his *Chronological History of New England in the Form of Annals with an Introduction Containing a Brief Epitome of Events Abroad from the Creation* (vol. i., Boston, 1736; nos. 1, 2, 3 of vol. ii., 1755; ed. Nathan Hale, Boston, 1826; ed. S. G. Drake, 1852). The history proper begins with 1602. He intended to bring it down to 1730; but almost twenty years elapsed after the appearance of the first volume, ere he began the second; and, his death coming soon after, he brought the history down no later than Aug. 5, 1633. During the Revolutionary War many of his manuscripts, kept in the tower of the Old South Church, were destroyed, and thus a large part of his invaluable collection respecting the early history of the country has perished. Besides this, he published a number of sermons, and *An Account of the Earthquakes of New England* (1755), and *New England Psalm Book Revised and Improved* (1758). His library, including his manuscripts, was bequeathed to the Old South Church, and by it deposited in the Public Library, Boston, 1866, of which a catalogue has been published.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: W. B. Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, i. 304–307, New York, 1859; W. Walker, in *American Church History Series*, iii. 110, 264–266, 274, ib. 1894; idem, *Ten New England Leaders*, pp. 38, 40, 279, 364, ib. 1901.

PRINS, JAN JACOB: Dutch theologian; b. at Langezwaag in Friesland in 1814; d. at Leyden May 24, 1898. He studied in Amsterdam and at Leyden; was Reformed pastor at Eemnes-Binnendyks (Utrecht), 1838; Alkmaar and Rotterdam, 1843–55; professor of exegetical and practical theology at Leyden, 1855–76, and of New-Testament criticism and hermeneutics, and of history of primitive Christian literature, in the same university, from 1876 till he retired in 1885. He was one of the synodical translators of the New Testament, and the author of *Disputatio theologica inauguralis de locis Euangelistarum, in quibus Jesus baptismi ritum subiisse traditur* (Amsterdam, 1838); *De Realiteit van's Heeren Opstanding uit de dooden* (Leyden, 1861); *Wetenschap en Kerk in hare wederzijdsche betrekking* (1867); *De Christelijke Zedeleer, de Geschiedenis des Bijbels en der Christelijke Kerk* (6 parts, Amsterdam, 1878); *De Maaltijd des Heeren in de Korinthische Gemeente, ten tijde van Paulus* (Leyden, 1868); *Over de Studie der Godgeleerdheid en de keuze van het predikambt in de Hervormde Kerk* (Amsterdam, 1868); and *Het Kerkrecht der Nederlandsche Hervormde Kerk* (Leyden, 1870).

PRIOR, PRIORESS: The title of an official over a monastery or convent next in rank to the abbot or abbess. Before the pontificate of Celestine V (1294), the term signified a monk of superior rank or greater age. After that time the *prior claustralis* was next to the abbot, and was appointed by him to inspect and control the deans, and to maintain discipline among the monks. The *prior conventualis* was master of his own monastery when it was an offshoot from another monastery, or he was superior of a house of canons.

PRISCA, PRISCILLA. See MONTANISM.

PRISCILLIAN, PRISCILLIANISTS: Bishop of Abila and Spanish sectary, and his followers; beheaded at Treves about 385. Apparently educated under Gnostic influences by a certain Manichean Marcus of Memphis, Priscillian held to the doctrine that charismata continued in the Church and regarded the Apocrypha (q.v.) as inspired. He was a rigid ascetic, though he did not forsake his wife even when he became bishop. The first literary production of Priscillian seems to have been his *Nonaginta canones*, which purport to refute heretics on the basis of the writings of Paul, and it is marked by a primitive and even Marcionitic spirit. Bishops and clergy on the whole are to be peaceable; apostles, prophets, and masters (doctors) are the divinely appointed orders of the Church, preeminence being due the doctors, among whom Priscillian reckoned himself. The "spiritual" comprehend and judge all things, being "children of wisdom and light"; and the distinction between flesh and spirit, darkness and light, Moses and Christ, and the "prince of this world" and Christ, are emphasized, so that two sorts of spirits and two wisdoms are contrasted. At the same time this dualism is blended with monism; but though Christ is both God and man, as man he is "not made of divinity, but of the seed of David and of woman," a primitive Christology, drawing upon him the charge of Photinianism (see PHOTINUS). Justification is by faith, and faith by the grace of God. Rigid asceticism, including abstinence from wine and meat, is recommended, and separation from unbelievers is urged. The Old Testament is ranked far below the New.

The Ninety Canons.

Priscillian was not content to remain a lay teacher and leader of conventicles. Like other ascetics, he wished to become priest and bishop to give his views more influence. So formidable became the movement that in 380 Bishop Hydatius of Emerita convened a synod at Saragossa in which he charged the ascetic faction with reading Apocryphal writings and with Novatianism, Photinianism, Manicheanism (see NOVATIAN; and MANICHEANS), and all sorts of heresy. Priscillian, still a layman, did not appear at the synod, though he wrote in reply his third tractate justifying the reading of the Apocrypha, without denying that their contents were partly spurious. The resolutions of the synod, which consisted of two Gallic and ten Spanish bishops, condemned certain practises of the conventicles; such as receiving the Eucharist in the church but eating it at home or in the conventicle; fasting for three weeks before Epiphany, as the day of Christ's birth and baptism (the twenty-fifth day of December being not yet accepted in Spain), and substituting meditation in the mountains for attending church during this period, fasting on the Sundays of the period of Quadragesima and on Sundays as a whole; their imitation of Christ in the desert during the forty days of Lent; and their preference of conventicles, in which women spoke and taught, to churches; and Priscillian, though forbidden to call himself doctor, was not expressly condemned. Hydatius, however, claimed that Priscillian and his adherents had been anathematized, whereupon bishops Hyginus of Cordova and Symposius of Astorga, sympathizers with Priscillian, advised that the matter be brought before a synod. The ascetic faction followed this suggestion the more readily since Priscillian was then consecrated bishop of Abila by Instantius and Salvianus. Hydatius, foreseeing defeat, obtained from Gratian a rescript against pseudo-bishops and Manicheans, whereupon Priscillian, Instantius, and Salvianus went to Damasus at Rome, and, laying before him a memorial (the second tractate), asked to be rehabilitated either by a synod or by the emperor. While both Damasus and Ambrose of Milan received the three Spanish bishops with suspicion, they obtained from Gratian a rescript relieving them of the charge of being pseudo-bishops and Manicheans, thus assuring Priscillian of his position.

Priscillian's God

Theologically (Tractates, iv.–xi.) Priscillian is the "God Christ"; he is not Patripassian but Christopassian. God is "invisible in the Father, visible in the Son," and the Holy Ghost is one in the work of the two. In Christ is all; without him, nothing. This God-Christ was to him the order of

the preexistent elements of the world, and in that sense the creator, as well as the repulsor of the dark powers of chaos. Earthborn powers and other potencies are maintained, but the vivification of chaos is the work of the Spirit of God. Throughout the system a certain dualism can not fail to be recognized. Man was made by God in the divine image; the Creator gave life to the human "body of an earthly dwelling"; man belongs, hence, to the earth; the natural man is subject to time; and the "divine race of men" is weakened by its earthly incorporation, whence the fall and paganism. The Mosaic law was the preparation for redemption through the prohibition of idolatry, while sacrifice was designed to kill the vices of man. Salvation was brought by Christ, and he suffered all to which man is subject. Through the birth and death of Christ the evils of human birth were purified, and the curses of earthly domination were crucified, so that he overcame the earthly nature of man. In accordance with the trichotomy of Priscillian a third testament of the Spirit should follow, but in his extant writings there are no details on this subject. In asceticism Priscillian distinguished three degrees, though he did not deny hope of pardon to those who were unable to attain full perfection. The perfect in body, mind, and spirit were celibate, or, if married, continent. Throughout his writings Priscillian appears as an archaizing Western Christian with ideals of rigid asceticism, and Gnostic in tendency. Though clearly unaware that he was heretical, his veiled dualism could scarcely be regarded as orthodox, and he must have written at least one work which was unquestionably Gnostic. In this he taught that the human soul, born of God, had proceeded from a certain "repository." Descending through a number of circles, it had been seized by malignant powers and imprisoned in divers bodies. This imprisonment had been confirmed by a divine autograph, which Christ had annulled by his death. The first circle appears to have been controlled by the patriarchs, who, as beneficent powers, controlled the "members of the soul," while the "members of the body" were subject to the zodiac. It would also seem that the Priscillianists assumed seven heavens (the "circles") with corresponding archons, the earth itself being given to a "malignant prince." According to Orosius, Priscillian derived these doctrines from a "memoir of the apostles," and this work must have spoken of the "prince of dampness" and the "prince of fire" as powers of nature. When God shows "the virgin of light" to the "prince of dampness," lightning and rain follow. His attribution of profound influence of the stars on man apparently substantiates the assertion that for many years Priscillian studied magic and astrology, and later as possessing the charismata he doubtless endeavored to heal the sick.

Views.

With the victorious return of Priscillian and Instantius, the controversy with the anti-ascetics seemed to be at an end. But their route through Gaul had brought the ascetics of that country into contact with those of Spain, so that they now felt themselves to be a power. The opposing bishops renewed their activity, the Spaniards being led by Ithacius Clarus, bishop of Sossuba (Ossonoba?) from before 379 to c. 388. Though he did not directly attack Priscillian, the latter appealed for protection to the proconsul Volventius, and Ithacius sought refuge in Gaul with the prefect Gregorius. Meanwhile Gratian had died, and the new emperor, willing to hear Ithacius, convened a synod at Bordeaux, in 385, where all parties concerned were to be heard. Here Priscillian defended himself in his first tractate, maintaining that the Apocrypha should be read, but declaring himself innocent of Patripassianism, Manicheanism, Ophitism, and other heresies, condemning Basilides, Arius (qq.v.), the Borborites (see Gnosticism, § 2), and Montanists (see Montanism), and denying that he worshiped stars and demons, or taught that man had been created by the devil. He likewise denied that he practised magic. The result of the synod had been determined from the first. Instantius was deposed, and Priscillian, to escape a worse state, appealed to the emperor. The decision took place at Treves. Ithacius, seconded by Hydatius, accused Priscillian of magic and Manicheanism, the penalty for either being death by Roman law. Martin of Tours, himself denounced by Ithacius as a heretic, interceded for Priscillian at court, urging that deposition was a sufficient penalty. Maximus solemnly promised to spare the lives of the accused; but the bishops Magnus and Rufus urged the emperor to break his word, and he entrusted the investigation to the prefect Evodius, who employed torture. Tertullus, Potamius, and Johannes, in order to escape a penalty, now confessed themselves and their friends as guilty. Evodius held Priscillian charged with sorcery and enforced a confession that the conventicles were basely immoral. Maximus could now take advantage of the victims to satisfy his avarice. Ithacius, hitherto the accuser, withdrew to avoid scandal among the bishops, and his place was taken, at the emperor's command, by a certain Patricius. Priscillian and four others were beheaded, the same fate soon overtaking Asarbus and the deacon Aurelius. Instantius and Tiberianus (whose property was confiscated) were banished, and Tertullus, Potamius, and Johannes were sentenced to brief exile.

The Priscillianists.

The execution of a bishop for sorcery and immorality (the latter charge entirely baseless) attracted attention far and wide, but with the fall of Maximus the tide changed. Hydatius resigned his see, while Ithacius was deposed and probably exiled from Spain. Priscillian, on the other hand, was regarded by his friends as a martyr. His sect spread widely, especially in Galicia (Spain), though no longer represented in the episcopate. So flourishing were they that appeal was made to Leo I. (440–461), who wrote an epoch-making letter (given in Eng. transl. in *NPNF*, 2 ser., xii. 20–26); a synod of Toledo (447) under the influence of the pope condemned the sect; and in 563 the Synod of Braga was obliged to deal with it, but thenceforth it vanished, being absorbed by the Cathari (see New Manicheans, II.). The ascetic and Gnostic sect of the Priscillianists must be regarded primarily as a phenomenon of Occidental monasticism and early

Christian enthusiasm, resulting in Gnosticism. The basis of the sect was the "Abstinentes" of Philaster (*Hær.*, lxxxiv.), groups of ascetics in Gaul and Spain under suspicion as to their theology, and apparently Encratites (q.v.) transplanted to the west. They had adopted Gnostic and Manichean elements, had rejected many foods as coming from the devil, and despised marriage. They, like the Priscillianists, were essentially the children of such apocryphal writings as the Acts of Thomas, Andrew, and John, and perhaps the Books of Ezra and an Epistle to the Laodiceans. Mingled with the Gnostic concepts of the Priscillianists, moreover, were pagan elements; and the conscious possession of non-Catholic secret doctrines, at once the advantage and the peril of the sect, is shown by the fact that the Priscillianist Dictinius, later Catholic bishop of Astorga, in his *Libra* asserted that Priscillianists were justified in falsehood if need be, deeming that they might make themselves pass for Catholic Christians providing they recognised in their hearts the truths opposed to the Church, veracity being required only toward fellow sectaries and not toward the Catholic church. (F. Lezius.)

Bibliography: For sources consult *Priscilliani quæ supersunt*, ed. G. Schepss, in *CSEL*, xviii. 1889. For discussions consult: *DCB*, iv. 470–478 (detailed); J. M. Mandernach, *Geschichte des Priscillianismus*, Treves, 1851; J. Bernays, *Die Chronik des Sulpicius Severus*, Berlin, 1861; P. B. Gams, *Kirchengeschichte von Spanien*, vol. ii., Regensburg, 1864; H. L. Mansel, *Gnostic Heresies*, lectures ix., xii., London, 1875; G. Schepss, *Priscillian*, Würzburg, 1886; idem, *Pro Priscilliano*, in *Wiener Studien*, pp. 128–147, Vienna, 1893; F. Paret, *Priscillian, Ein Reformator des 4. Jahrhunderts*, Würzburg, 1891; Hilgenfeld, in *ZWT*, 1892, pp. 1–84; Dierich, *Die Quellen zur Geschichte des Priscillianismus*, Breslau, 1897; F. Lezius, *Die Libra des Dictinius*, in *Abhandlungen A. von Oettingen gewidmet*, pp. 113–124, Munich, 1898; K. Künstle, *Antipriscilliana. Dogmengeschichtliche Untersuchungen und Texte aus dem Streite gegen Priscillians Lehre*, Freiburg, 1905; E. C. Babut, *Priscillien et le priscillianisme*, Paris, 1909; Harnack, *Dogma*, iii. 336, iv. 133, v. 58, vi. 8; Neander, *Christian Church*, ii. 354, 771–779. A considerable body of periodical literature is indicated in Richardson, *Encyclopaedia*, p. 882.

PRISON REFORM.

I. History of Imprisonment.
II. Theory of Treatment of Prisoners.
III. Penology.
IV. The Modern System.

I. History of Imprisonment: In modern conditions care of prisoners coincides with care for those undergoing punishment, since now the withdrawal of liberty is the principal punishment for crime. This idea has developed only gradually. The history of prisons may be divided into three periods: (1) Until the fifteenth century the prison was not a means of punishment. "Prisons served not for punishment, only for surveillance." Penalties consisted of fines, proscriptions, and different forms of capital and corporal punishment. (2) During the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries imprisonment became a form of punishment. The number of cases in which capital punishment and chastisement were applied became so numerous that people asked whether capital punishment was right, and the idea of betterment through punishment gained adherents. But prison conditions were still horrible. (3) In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries imprisonment came to be regarded as a means of betterment, this coming about especially through the labors of John Howard and Elizabeth Fry (qq.v.). In Germany the old conditions perpetuated themselves longest. There was no division of classes in the prisons (not even always a separation of the sexes), no pastoral care, and neither instruction nor employment, while the personnel was inefficient and the buildings were defective. Theodor Fliedner (q.v.) gave the first impulse to a betterment of these conditions. But without the influence of Frederick William IV such reforms would have been impossible. Another laborer in this field was Johann Heinrich Wichern (q.v.).

II. Theory of Treatment of Prisoners: Present conditions regarding the care of prisoners involve: (1) Care for the prisoners during the time of their confinement. An important factor here is the prison-pastor. Every large prison has one or more ministers; in smaller places the clergyman of the community has charge of these matters. Every Sunday church services are held at which the attendance of the prisoners is obligatory. But not less important is the teacher, who gives instruction in the elementary branches, criminals being generally without the simplest elements of knowledge. In charge of the teacher a library is found in each prison. The inspector is also a factor. In Germany the military have usually held these positions in spite of the fact that they often lack the necessary qualifications. Wichern tried to introduce specially trained men from his own charitable institution, but failed. Little has been done so far in the direction of training women to care for prisoners of their own sex. (2) The care of prisoners after their dismission is also a part of the system. For this purpose there exist protective associations. Neither the State nor individual cities nor churches have done much for this cause. Associations for this purpose are mostly voluntary. An important part of their duties is the care of the family of the prisoner. For the dismissed there is secured employment, if possible, and other aid and assistance are given him though there are only a few asylums for men for temporary lodging, while homes for women are more numerous. It is to be regretted, however, that there is little zeal developed in these protective associations and their success is small, but, of course, the field of labor is a difficult one. (T. Schäfer.)

Prison conditions regarding the care of prisoners involve (1): The care of prisoners during the time of their confinement. The purposes of the deprivation of liberty are (a) punishment, (b) deterrent effects, (c) reformative effects, (d) the protection of society. These factors are emphasized differently in different countries. In Europe, emphasis has been laid chiefly upon punishment and the protection of society. In the United States, probably more than in any other country, the protection of society and the reclamation of the offender are emphasized. Upon the distribution of emphasis depends the nature of the care of prisoners during their confinement. European conditions are in general more rigorous and less reformative in method than American prison conditions. Important factors during

imprisonment in prisons generally are the warden and his associates, the prison physician, the prison chaplain, and the prison teacher. Every large prison has one or more chaplains; in smaller communities, correctional institutions are frequently visited by one or more of the clergymen of the community. In most prisons, if not in all, Sunday church services are held with obligatory attendance. Of great importance are prison teachers, giving instruction in the elementary branches of education. Offenders are in large measure lacking even in the simplest elements of knowledge. Libraries are found in most prisons. In some American prisons, the library is as large and as well selected as libraries in small American cities. The lesser prison officials, such as guards and keepers, are gradually becoming of a higher grade. Civil-service requirements are in effect in many American states. Physical exercise, military drill, and industrial training within the prison tend to reconstruct the abnormal man into a normal and useful member of society upon his release. Much attention is paid in the United States to sanitary conditions in prisons and penitentiaries. Lesser correctional institutions are frequently unsanitary and even filthy. The treatment of tuberculosis in prisons has received great impetus during the last decade, largely through the efforts of New York state in establishing in one of the state prisons a separate ward for prisoners afflicted with the " White Plague." The death rate from tuberculosis has been very materially reduced through such segregation.

(2) The care of prisoners after their release is also a part of the system of the treatment of prisoners. In many American states, a more or less effective parole system is carried out. Released prisoners are placed under the supervision of a parole agent for periods of from six months to the period of the maximum sentence. No conclusive statistics are available as to the percentage of permanent reformation of released prisoners. About twenty-five per cent of released prisoners become delinquent before the termination of their parole. The parole system is increasingly considered fully as necessary as the imprisonment of the offenders. The tendency is to place the parole work under the supervision of the State. In some states, private associations, such as prisoners' aid societies, conduct the parole work. In many states, no parole work is done. An important part of the duties of prisoners' aid societies is the care of the family of the prisoner during his imprisonment. For the released prisoner employment is secured, if possible, and other aid and assistance given him. There are a few homes for discharged prisoners in the United States, the Volunteers of America (q.v.) maintaining several " Hope Halls."

The released or discharged prisoner does not now find it so difficult as formerly to obtain work. The attitude of society toward the released prisoner is materially changing, the principle of the " square deal " making gratifying progress. O. F. Lewis.

III. Penology: The Greek word *poine*, denoting the satisfaction, pecuniary or otherwise, paid for an injury, passing through the Latin *pœna*, " penalty," has become enlarged in later years to signify in " penology " the whole science of penal law, penal administration, the prevention of crime, and the correction of the offender. In each of these departments there is a new recognition of fundamental principles, some of them early discerned but tardily applied, and an infusion of new knowledge and of the humane sentiment. Jesus set aside the retaliatory features of the Jewish law. Modern penal law can hardly be said to have eradicated vindictive features entirely from its codes; but the modern tendency is to make such codes measures of social defense with deterrent rather than vindictive penalties. Fundamental principles of the new penology are the protection of society and the reformation of the offender. In Plato's social system there was a recognition of the duty of kindness and pity toward the prisoner; in the New Testament it has a distinct prominence in the teaching of Jesus. In modern times the most important point of departure from the old penal system dates from the publication of the work entitled *Dei delitti e delle pene* (" Crimes and Penalties ") in 1769 by Cesare Beccaria Bonesana, an Italian nobleman, and from the personal work of John Howard (q.v.), who began his visitations of prisons in England in 1773 and extended his work and inspections over the continent. Beccaria's influence was felt mainly in the abolition of torture and of capital punishment, and the reformation of criminal codes. Howard initiated reforms in the physical, moral, and industrial conditions of prison life. The duty of society to the offender was considered in all its aspects. Elizabeth Fry exerted great influence in the last century in Great Britain and Europe, also Mary Carpenter (q.v.), Matthew Davenport Hill, and others. Alexander Maconochie at Norfolk Island, and Sir Walter Crofton in Ireland, enlightened and progressive prison directors, demonstrated the possibility of making new moral and educational appeals to the prisoners with grades and privileges based on the merit system.

IV. The Modern System: The same principle with independent and original application has borne fruit in the reformatory system in the United States. Juvenile reformatories for boys and girls were established in the first half of the last century; but a new epoch marks the extension of the idea to institutions for those from sixteen to thirty years of age first established in Elmira, New York, in 1876 under Z. R. Brockway and since adopted in ten American states. A fundamental feature of the reformatory system is the indeterminate sentence. The prisoner is not committed for a definite time to the institution, but is obliged to secure his conditional release by his attainments in school, industry, and deportment. When he has earned his parole he is released tentatively, and after proving by some months of good conduct his ability to live an honest, law-abiding life receives his absolute discharge. If not corrigible, he can be detained for the maximum period fixed by the code as the penalty of the offense for which he was committed. The probation system of treating offenders without imprisonment was first adopted in Massachusetts in 1878 and afterward adopted in France, Belgium, and various American states. Another important American contribution is juvenile courts first es-

tablished in Chicago in 1899 and soon after adopted in other states and also in Europe. The system of county jails in the United States still remains the worst feature of American prisons. The tendency is now toward state control of prisoners with better sanitation, an improvement in the personnel of prison officials, the introduction of common schools, trade-schools, libraries, prison journals, lectures, and the formation of various societies among the prisoners. In Europe the system of separate confinement is applied in a number of countries; in the United States the prevailing system is congregate labor by day and separate cells by night. Reduction of sentence is allowed for good behavior, and the parole system is now applied in some thirty states. The abolition of the lease system in Georgia and Louisiana marks a great advance in the South. Educative and productive labor is a fundamental necessity as a moral agent in prison. Other features of modern progress are a better standard of prison construction, the assignment to prisoners of a portion of their earnings; provision for the payment of fines by instalments on probation and the assignment of a portion of the prisoner's wages to his family; an improvement in prison dietaries; new and better principles of classification, the development by finger prints of a scientific method for the identification of prisoners, the separation of accidental from habitual criminals, the humane treatment of the criminal insane, with more effective organization for aid to the discharged prisoner. Under Cesare Lombroso, Enrico Ferri, and others a new impulse has been given to the study of the criminal, his environment, and history, though criminal anthropology has hardly attained yet the rank of a science. Prison associations for improving legislation and aiding prisoners exist in several states. The National (now "American") Prison Association in the United States was first formed in 1870, and immediately after, under the initiative of Dr. E. C. Wines, supported by the government of the United States, the International Prison Congress was formed, and has exercised great influence in Europe and the United States.

SAMUEL J. BARROWS†.

The Eighth International Prison Congress was held in Washington, U. S. A., in October, 1910, and marked high-tide in the advocacy of modern principles of penology. The congress, composed of representatives of nearly two-score nations, went on record as advocating the principle of the indeterminate sentence, the theory of the reformation of the offender, the use of probation and parole, the development of colonies for tramps and vagrants and inebriates, the productive labor of prisoners and the support, when possible, of prisoners' families from the earnings of the prisoner, the development and extension of the juvenile court and other important modern principles. O. F. LEWIS.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Of great value are the "Acts," etc., of international congresses on penology and prison reform held at Stockholm 1878, Rome 1885, St. Petersburg 1890, Paris 1895, Brussels 1900, and Washington 1910. Consult further: F. H. Wines, *Punishment and Reformation, Sketch of the Rise of the Penitentiary System*, New York, 1895, 9th ed., 1910; E. F. Du Cane, *Account of the Manner in which Sentences of Penal Servitude are carried out*, London, 1882; J. P. Altgeld, *Our Penal Machinery*, Chicago, 1884; E. F. Du Cane, *Punishment of Crime*, 1885; F. von Holtzendorff, *Handbuch des Gefängnisswesens*, 2 vols., Hamburg, 1888; A. Gioux, *Sur le régime pénitentiaire*, Poitiers, 1889; K. Krohne, *Lehrbuch der Gefängnisskunde*, Stuttgart, 1889; V. Leitmaier, *Oesterreichische Gefängnisskunde*, Vienna, 1890; C. Wulff, *Die Gefängnisse der Justizverwaltung in Preussen*, Hamburg, 1890; C. Cook, *The Prisons of the World*, London, 1891; A. Winter, *New York State Reformatory in Elmira*, London, 1891; J. C. Powell, *The American Siberia: a southern convict Camp*, London, 1892; F. Stuckenberg, *Fængselsvæsenet i Danmark, 1550–1741*, Copenhagen, 1893; C. Hiller, *Die Disciplinarstrafen in den oesterreichischen Strafanstalten*, Leipsic, 1894; W. Tallack, *Penological and Preventative Principles, with Special Reference to Europe and America*, London, 1896; H. S. Wilson, *History and Criticism: Studies on the Conciergerie*, London, 1896; G. Bonneron, *Notre régime pénitentiaire. Les Prisons de Paris*, Paris, 1897; A. Lecci, *Il Sistema penitenziario e il Domicilio coatto in Italia*, Rome, 1897; J. George, *Humanität und Kriminalstrafen vom Mittelalter bis auf die Gegenwart*, Jena, 1898; H. M. Boies, *The Science of Penology*, New York, 1901; C. Krohne and R. Uber, *Die Strafanstalten in Preussen*, Berlin, 1901; G. Vidal, *Cours de droit criminel et de science pénitentiaire*, Paris, 1901; G. Curli and A. Bianchi, *Le nostre Carceri e i nostri Riformatorii*, Milan, 1902; A. Macdonald, *Hearing on the Bill to Establish a Laboratory for the Study of the Criminal and Defective Classes*, Washington, 1902; M. B. Booth, *After Prison—what?* New York, 1903; H. Leuss, *Aus dem Zuchthause*, Berlin, 1903; W. B. Nevill, *Penal Servitude*, London, 1903; *The Mark of the Broad Arrow; or, the Life of a Convict*, London, 1903; E. Carpenter, *Prisons, Police and Punishment*, London, 1905; P. Cuche, *Traité de science et de législation pénitentiaires*, Paris, 1905; E. Spira, *Die Zuchthaus- und Gefängnisstrafe, ihre Differenzierung und Stellung im Strafgesetze*, Munich, 1905; A. Lenz, *Die anglo-amerikanische Reformbewegung im Strafrecht*, Stuttgart, 1908; P. A. Parsons, *Responsibility for Crime: an Investigation of the Nature and Causes of Crime and a Means of its Prevention*, New York, 1909. For periodical literature consult Richardson, *Encyclopaedia*, p. 882.

PROBA: Christian centoist of the fourth century. She was the daughter of Petronius Probianus, consul in 310, and wife of Clodius Celsinus Adelphius, prefect of Rome after 351. "Cento" originally meant a cloak made of patches, and then came to be applied to compositions constructed from words and lines taken from the poets and put together to express a content other than the original. The making of centos from the verses of Homer and Vergil was much affected, and even Christians so employed themselves. Before her conversion to Christianity Proba composed one, not extant, on the conflict between Constantius and Maxentius. Afterward she embodied in like compositions the story of creation to the flood, the birth of Christ, and his passion, writing in hexameters. Of course the original coloring was lost; at the baptism, e.g., the Father uses words employed by Juno, Turnus, and others. Yet it is remarkable how impressive the results sometimes are. Pope Gelasius refused the sanction of the Church to such efforts, but in spite of this the cento appears to have been much read in the Middle Ages, as is evidenced by many existing manuscripts and the mention of many more. One manuscript contains besides the cento of Proba three other works of this character: *Pomponii versus in gratiam domini*,—instruction concerning Christianity in a discussion between Melibæus and Tityrus, evidently in imitation of Proba; *De verbi incarnatione*, a fragment not by Sedulius; and *De ecclesia*. There is dis-

played here a certain dexterity in the use of lines from Vergil to construct, for example, a long address by a priest. (G. KRÜGER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The best ed. is by C. Schenkl in *CSEL*, xxvi. pp. 511–627, Vienna, 1888. Consult: J. Aschbach, *Die Anicier und die römische Dichterin Proba*, Vienna, 1870; A. Ebert, *Geschichte der Litteratur des Mittelalters*, i. 125 sqq., Leipsic, 1889; M. Manitius, *Geschichte der christlich-lateinischen Poesie*, pp. 123–130, Stuttgart, 1891; G. von Dzialowski, *Isidor und Ildefons als Litterarhistoriker*, pp. 29–30, Münster, 1898.

PROBABILISM: A doctrine of Roman Catholic moral theology that in case of ethical problems the course of conduct to be adopted should be determined by what is adjudged to be probably right, with due support of precedent and authority recognized by the Church. Analogues to the system may be found among later Greek philosophers, particularly the Neo-Academics Carneades and Clitomachus, as well as in the distinction drawn by Cicero (*De officiis*, i. 3) between "perfect duty" and "medium duty," for the performance of which "a probable reason may be assigned." A tendency toward probabilism early became evident in the Church, as in the admissibility of a certain degree of "pious fraud" in the theory of the Greek Fathers after Chrysostom. It was further developed in the medieval Penitential Books (q.v.) with their frequent formula "there is no harm" in regard to matters ethically equivalent or indifferent; and it received a powerful impulse in the balancing of conflicting authorities by the scholastic casuistry of the last three centuries of the Middle Ages. Here reference need only be made to the *Summa Angelica* of Angelus Carsetus (d. 1495), the *Summa rosella* of Giovanni Baptista Trovamala (fifteenth century), the *Regulæ morales* of Jean Charlier Gerson (q.v.); and the Dominicans of the sixteenth century, particularly the school of Melchior Cano (q.v.). Bartolome de Medina (d. 1581), followed by Domingo Bañez (d. 1604), enunciated the doctrine that "if an opinion is probable, it may be followed, even though a more probable opinion be opposed."

With these precedents Jesuit moralists, after the beginning of the seventeenth century, developed the doctrine of probabilism with extreme subtility and logic. Probabilism was formally introduced into the courses in moral theology by Gabriel Vasquez in 1598; and Antonio Escobar y Mendoza (q.v.) defended the tenet that an ethical judgment supported as probable by a recognized authority might unhesitatingly be preferred to another opinion which was safer and more probable. This principle affected the confessional, since a penitent who could appeal to a probable opinion must be absolved by his confessor, even though the latter were of a different opinion; while attrition was probabilistically made to suffice for contrition. Escobar likewise taught that the great number of divergent moral opinions is one of the chief proofs of the goodness of divine providence, since the yoke of Christ is thus made easy. Hermann Busenbaum (q.v.), in similar fashion, warned against giving too much weight to excessive scruples of conscience, and urged that in each case the mildest and safest opinion should be followed. Probabilistic arguments were also used in defense of such teachings as the distinction between philosophical and theological sin and mental reservation.

As early as 1620 the Sorbonne protested against the doctrine of probabilism, and in 1656 Pascal attacked it in his "Provincial Letters." Renewed protests of the Sorbonne in 1658 and 1665 led Alexander VII. to condemn probabilism and the moral theories connected with it (Sept. 24, 1665). Opponents of the doctrine arose within the Jesuit order, among them Paolo Comitoli (d. 1626) and Michael de Elizalde; Innocent XI., in 1679, condemned sixty-five probabilistic theses as laxistic. In 1687 the thirteenth general congregation of the Jesuits officially declared that the Society of Jesus was not opposed to anti-probabilism, although when Tyrso Gonzalez, the Jesuit general, attacked probabilism in his *Fundamenta theologiæ moralis* (Dillingen, 1691), he encountered the most strenuous opposition from his order. A severe blow was dealt probabilism when, in 1700, the assembly of the clergy of France forbade it to be taught. Additional Jesuit authors also opposed it, though its most unsparing enemies were the Dominicans. The net result was a series of modifications of probabilism, of which the Jesuit casuistry of the eighteenth century evolved three chief types. These were equiprobabilism, according to which one of two moral opinions may be followed only if it is exactly as probable as the other; probabiliorism, in which, if the probabilities are not equal, that which is more probable must determine the course of action; and tutiorism, according to which the safer, rather than the more probable, opinion is to be followed. See CASUISTRY. (O. ZÖCKLER†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: On the history of the subject consult: D. Concina, *Storia del Probabilismo e Rigorismo*, 2 vols., Lucca, 1748; K. F. Stäudlin, *Geschichte der christlichen Moral*, pp. 448, 489, 523 sqq., Göttingen, 1808; A. Wuttke, *Handbuch der christlichen Sittenlehre*, ed. L. Schulze, i. 284, Leipsic, 1874; J. J. I. von Döllinger and F. H. Reusch, *Geschichte der Moralstreitigkeiten in der römisch-katholischen Kirche*, i. 28 sqq., 94 sqq., 120 sqq., 412 sqq., Munich, 1889; H. C. Lea, *History of Confession and Indulgences*, ii. 285–411, New York, 1896; A. Schmidt, *Zur Geschichte des Probabilismus*, Innsbruck, 1904; *KL*, viii. 1874–88; S. Mentré, *Cournot et la renaissance du probabilisme au xix. siècle*, Paris, 1908.

For criticism, besides the fifth of Pascal's "Provincial Letters," consult: S. Rachel, *Examen probabilitatis Jesuiticæ*, Helmstedt, 1864; C. E. Luthardt, *Geschichte der christlichen Ethik*, ii. 125–129, Leipsic, 1893; J. Müller, *System der Philosophie*, part iii., Mainz, 1898; idem, *Reformkatholicismus*, ii. 132–152, Zurich, 1898; Lieber, in *Deutsche Stimmen*, pp. 312 sqq., Cologne, 1901; W. Hermann, *Römische und evangelische Sittlichkeit*, 2d ed., Marburg, 1901; A. Ehrhard, *Der Katholicismus und das 20. Jahrhundert*, pp. 198 sqq., Freiburg, 1902; P. von Hoensbroech, *Die ultramontane Moral*, pp. 50–70, Berlin, 1902.

For apologetics on the subject consult: A. Ballerini, *Opus theologicum morale*, ed. Palmieri, vol. i., 1898; K. A. Leimbach, *Untersuchungen über die verschiedenen Moralsysteme*, Fulda, 1894; C. Pesch, *Prælectiones dogmaticæ*, iii. 340–346, Freiburg, 1895; F. A. Göpfert, *Moraltheologie*, i. 167 sqq., Paderborn, 1897; J. Mausbach, *Die ultramontane Moral nach Graf P. von Hoensbroech*, pp. 29 sqq., Berlin, 1902; Franz ter Haar, *Das Dekret des . . Innocenz XI. über den Probabilismus*, Paderborn, 1904; A. Lehmkuhl, *Probabilismus vindicatus*, Freiburg, 1906.

PROBATION, FUTURE: An expression carrying the implication that in the future world the

Gospel will be decisively offered to all who did not in this world finally reject Christ, and that those who there accept him will be saved. As here defined, it is to be distinguished (1) from the orthodox doctrine of probation—it extends the offer of salvation into the future life under the conditions above mentioned (see JUDGMENT, DIVINE); (2) from dogmatic Universalism (q.v.)—it leaves in doubt the ultimate issue of the probation; (3) from a second probation—only a single probation is affirmed; (4) from the Roman Catholic doctrine of Purgatory (q.v.), which is not that of probation at all, but of the cleansing of such as have departed this life in faith; (5) from the assertion that the probation of all men extends into the next world—character may be decisively determined here below. The theory was advocated by I. A. Dorner, *System der christlichen Glaubenslehre* (2 vols., Berlin, 1879, 2d. ed., 1886–87; Engl. transl., *System of Christian Doctrine*, 4 vols., Edinburgh, 1880–82), and drew much attention to itself in the so-called "Andover Controversy," through its reappearance in *Progressive Orthodoxy* (pp. 67–111, Boston, 1885) by professors in Andover Theological Seminary. It was there maintained that the destiny of all men will be irrevocably fixed at the judgment, and that the principle of judgment is, Christ is the Judge. Scripture support for the hypothesis is sought not so much in specific passages (I Pet. iii. 18–20, iv. 5–6; Matt. xi. 21–22, x. 32) as in its harmony with the central principle of Christianity there contained, i.e., the absolutely universal destination of the Gospel, which rests upon the universal significance of Christ's person and work, and which guarantees that the final state of all souls shall be decided by their conscious acceptance or rejection of Christ as Savior and Lord. A doctrine as to the condition of many of the dead, having points of agreement with the foregoing presentation, is advocated by Edward White, *Life in Christ*, chap. xxii. (London, 1878). See ESCHATOLOGY, § 5.

C. A. BECKWITH.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: G. F. Wright, *An Inquiry concerning the Relation of Death to Probation*, Boston, 1882; G. H. Emerson, *The Doctrine of Probation Examined*, Boston, 1883; N. Smyth, *Dorner on the Future State*, New York, 1883; S. Leathes and others, *Future Probation*, London, 1886; S. M. Vernon, *Probation and Punishment*, New York, 1890; E. C. Gordon, in *Presbyterian Quarterly*, xi (1897), 218–230; G. P. Jackson, *Man an Eternal Probationer*, Nashville, Tenn., 1902. Further literature will be found under ESCHATOLOGY; HADES; and INTERMEDIATE STATE.

PROCESSION OF THE HOLY GHOST. See FILIOQUE CONTROVERSY.

PROCESSIONS: In restricted ecclesiastical usage, the term applies to the solemn entrance of the clergy and their assistants to the altar for mass or other liturgical worship, or of their return after the service to the sacristy. In a more general sense, procession means the moving in formal order, within or without the church, of a religious body, the head of which, such as bishop or priest, walks last, those highest in dignity next before him, and those lowest come first. It is taken as an obvious symbolism representing the Christian journey, and arises from the interest in giving expression to varying inner religious states, beyond the confines of the altar. They may be (1) processions of festal joy or commemoration, expressive of thanksgiving; or (2) of prayer and penitential processions (called *litaniæ, rogationes, supplicationes*), as on days of petition and on occasions of great calamity or visitation; or (3) processions of honor to bishops or other dignitaries at their consecration or visitation; or (4) funeral processions. The procession may be attended with prayers and music and accompanied by candles, by statues of saints as on saints' days, or by relics as in dedications. They may be extraordinary, called by special ecclesiastical order, or, as most frequently, ordinary, prescribed by ritual law, such as Palm Sunday and Corpus Christi. In early times the persecutions hindered their growth, although funeral processions seemed to have been known. Tertullian names *processio, procedere*, alongside of stated worship and fasting, as a religious practise in the sense of church attendance (*Ad uxorem*, ii. 4; *Hær.*, xliii.; Eng. transl., *ANF*, iii. 264). By the fourth century processions with relics were common. In Constantinople where the Arians were not allowed to worship within the walls, they moved in processions on the streets with the singing of hymns, and Chrysostom instituted similar ones among the orthodox. A notice by Ambrose (*Epist.*, xl., *ad Theodosium*) shows that processions were in use in the West at the same time, at least among the monks. During the Middle Ages this feature in connection with all ceremonial was developed with great magnificence by the Roman Catholic Church.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Bingham, *Origines*, XIII., i. 12, XXII., iii. 8; *DCA*, ii. 1715–17; J. Gretser, *De catholicæ ecclesiæ sacris processionibus*, Ingoldstadt, 1600; J. Eveillon, *De processionibus ecclesiasticis*, Paris, 1641; D. Vatar, *Des processions de l'église*, ib. 1705; J. E. Riddle, *Manual of Christian Antiquities*, pp. 757–758, 771–774, 833, 2d ed., London, 1843; M. E. C. Walcott, *Sacred Archæology*, ib. 1860; L. Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, passim, London, 1904; *KL*, x. 448–450.

PROCHET, MATTEO: Italian Waldensian; b. at Lucerna San Giovanni (30 m. s.w. of Turin) Sept. 28, 1836; d. at Rome Feb. 16, 1907 He was educated at the Waldensian college of Torre-Pellice, and, after serving the required year in the army, he studied theology at Florence and spent a semester in the Presbyterian College, Belfast. After serving as an evangelist in Lucca and Pisa (1861–66), and Genoa (1866–70), he was the first Protestant clergyman to enter Rome after its capture by Victor Immanuel, and there founded a Waldensian church (1870), of which he was pastor till 1875, although in 1871 he had been appointed president of the Italian Evangelization Committee, a position which he retained until 1906, when he was compelled to retire from active life on account of the age limit. He must be regarded as almost the pioneer in the modern active Protestant propaganda in Italy.

PROCKSCH, OTTO: German Protestant; b. at Eisenberg (34 m. s.w. of Leipsic), Saxe-Altenburg, Aug. 9, 1874. He was educated at the universities of Tübingen, Leipsic, Erlangen, and Göttingen (Ph.D., Leipsic, 1899), and at the seminary for preachers in Leipsic (1898–1900). In 1901 he became privat-docent for Old-Testament exegesis at

the University of Königsberg; was made extraordinary professor at Greifswald in 1906, and ordinary professor in 1909. He has written *Ueber die Blutrache bei den vorislamischen Arabern und Mohammeds Stellung zu ihr* (Leipsic, 1899); *Geschichtsbetrachtung und geschichtliche Ueberlieferung bei den vorexilischen Propheten* (1902); *Das nordhebräische Sagenbuch* (1906); *Johannes der Täufer* (1907); and *Studien zur Geschichte der Septuaginta* (1910).

PROCLUS. See Neo-Platonism, III., § 3.

PROCOPIUS OF CÆSAREA: Byzantine historian; b. at Cæsarea in Palestine toward the close of the fifth century; d. probably after 562. After 527 he was the legal companion and secretary of Belisarius in the campaigns in Persia, Africa, and Italy, so that as an eye-witness he described in eight books the wars against the Persians, Vandals, and Goths. More important for ecclesiastical conditions were his six books, *Peri ktismatōn* (*De ædificiis Justiniani imperatoris*, Paris, 1663, Eng. transl., *On Justinian's Buildings*, London, 1886); his *Anecdota* contain only scandals concerning Justinian, Theodora, Belisarius and his wife, and the entire court. Theologically he was orthodox; to him Christ was God, and Mary the mother of God. He was plainly disinclined to dogmatic partizanship, and Christian and classical elements appear unfused in his writings. As a historian he is of the highest importance. His works have been edited by L. Dindorf in *CSHB* (3 vols., Bonn., 1833–38); by J. Haury (3 vols., Leipsic, 1905–06); and there is an edition, with Italian translation, of the wars of the Goths by D. Comparetti (2 vols., Rome, 1895–1896), and a German translation in *Geschichtsschreiber der deutschen Vorzeit* (6th year, vols. ii.–iii., by D. Costi, Leipsic, 1885). (N. Bonwetsch.)

Bibliography: F. Dahn, *Prokop von Cäsarea*, Berlin, 1885; L. von Ranke, *Weltgeschichte*, iv. 2, pp. 285 sqq., Leipsic, 1883; F. J. Hartmann, *Untersuchungen über den Gebrauch des Modi in der Historien des Prokops*, Regensburg, 1903; Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, pp. 230–236 (with fine list of helps); *DCB*, iv. 487–488.

PROCOPIUS OF GAZA: Christian rhetorician; b. in Gaza c. 465; d. there before 528. The school of rhetoric at Gaza was widely celebrated for its teachers, among whom were Æneas (see Æneas of Gaza), and Procopius, "the Christian sophist." Of the latter's life little is known except that he spent it in the town of his birth, refusing calls to Antioch and Tyre. He is known to have carried on an extensive correspondence with contemporaries, and Choricius describes him as modest, unpretentious, and idealistic. His writings are partly rhetorical, partly exegetical. Of his speeches only one is extant—the bombastic encomium of the Emperor Anastasius I., probably written between 512 and 515. The description of the Church of St. Sophia and the lament over the falling of its cupola during an earthquake in 558 are not genuine. On account of the loss of so much of his work the more valuable is the possession of 162 letters, partly recommendations to pupils and others, partly on philosophical or rhetorical themes, which give insight into the ecclesiastical species of sophistics of the period. Among his exegetical works is his commentary in the form of a Catenæ (q.v., §§ 3, 7) on the Octateuch, in which the attempt has been made by Lindl (see bibliography below) to prove that the complete Hexaplar text as it was in the time of Procopius is in existence. It has been shown by Wendland, Klostermann, and Eisenhofer that Procopius drew upon Philo, Origen, Basil of Cæsarea, Gregory of Nyssa, Apollinaris of Laodicea, and Cyril of Alexandria. The commentary on Kings and Chronicles is practically all from Theodoret. For Isaiah and the epitome of the Octateuch, Cyril, Eusebius of Cæsarea, and Theodore of Heraclea are the sources. The best preserved is the commentary on the Song of Songs. The commentary on Proverbs is but an epitome by Procopius of his catena. His works, so far as they are preserved, are in *MPG*, lxxxvii. 1–242; his letters are best found in *Epistolographi Græci*, ed. R. Hercher, pp. 533–598 (Paris, 1873). (G. Krüger.)

Bibliography: The funeral oration of Choricius is in Boissonade, *Choricii Gazasi Orationes . fragmenta*, pp. 1–24, Paris, 1846. Consult: L. Eisenhofer, *Procopius von Gaza*, Freiburg, 1897; T. Zahn, *Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, ii. 239–256, Leipsic, 1883; P. Wendland, *Neuentdeckte Fragmente Philos*, Berlin, 1891; E. Klostermann, *Griechische Exzerpte aus Homilien des Origines*, in *TU*, xii. 3 (1894), 1–12; E. Lindl, *Die Oktateuchcatene des Prokop von Gaza*, Munich, 1902; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, xi. 176–180; *DCB*, iv. 486–487.

PROCOPIUS, ANDREAS, THE GREAT: Bohemian priest; b. in Bohemia about 1380; d. at Lipau, near Böhmisch-Brod (20 m. e. of Prague), May 30, 1434. On the death of Zizka, in 1424, he succeeded him as leader of the Hussite army. He was sprung from the lower nobility, and had been a follower of John Huss (see Huss, John, Hussites). As a priest he never bore arms; but he learned warfare under Zizka, and conducted campaigns with consummate skill. He was more of a statesman than Zizka, and his policy was to terrify Europe into peace with Bohemia. In 1426 he invaded Saxony, and defeated the Germans at Aussig. In 1427 he turned to flight a vast host of Crusaders at Tachau, and in 1431 he routed the forces of Germany at Tauss. These victories rendered inevitable the assembling of the Council of Basel. In Jan., 1433, Procopius and fourteen other Bohemian leaders came to Basel to confer with the council (see Basel, Council of). Bohemia, anxious to present a united front to the council, strove to reduce the town of Pilsen, which still held to Roman Catholicism. The siege did not succeed, a mutiny against Procopius arose in the army, and he retired from the management of affairs in Sept., 1433. Soon after this, the Bohemian Diet accepted the "compacts" of the council. The idea of peace spread rapidly; and a party in favor of the restoration of Sigismund as king of Bohemia began to form. Procopius roused himself to oppose the royalist league. In May, 1434, the royalist army met the Taborites, under Procopius, at Lipau, and after a desperate fight, he was defeated and killed.

Bibliography: Creighton, *Papacy*, ii. 188–262; F. Palacky, *Geschichte von Böhmen*, vol. iii., Prag, 1850; idem, *Urkundliche Beiträge zur Geschichte des Hussitenkriegs, 1419–36*, 2 vols., ib. 1873–74; C. Höfler, *Geschichtsschreiber der hussitischen Bewegung*, 3 vols., Vienna, 1856–66; E. H. Gillett, *Life and Times of John Huss*, vol. i. passim, Phila-

delphia, 1861. Sidelights from the papal side are cast by Pastor, *Popes*, vol. i.

PROCTER, JOHN: English Dominican; b. at Manchester Jan. 23, 1849. He was educated at the Dominican colleges at Hinckley (1863–66) and London (1867–72) and at the University of Louvain (1872–74; S.T.L., 1874). In 1872 he was ordained to the priesthood, and in 1866–72, 1874–78, 1882–1883, and 1885–1900 was stationed at St. Dominic's Priory, London, and also conducted a large number of missions and retreats in England, Ireland, Scotland, and the United States. He has been superior of the Dominican Houses in Newcastle-on-Tyne (1878–82), Leicester (1883–85), and London (1888–94), and was provincial of his order from 1894 to 1902. Since 1906 he has been parish priest of St. Dominic's Priory Church, London. He has written *Savonarola and the Reformation* (London, 1898); *Saint Sebastian, Lay-Apostle and Martyr* (1899); *The Rosary Confraternity* (1899); *The Living Rosary* (1900); *Indulgences* (1900); *The Catholic Creed; or, What do Catholics believe?* (1900); *The Rosary Guide for Priests and People* (1901); *The Dominican Tertiary's Daily Manual* (1901); *The Perpetual Rosary* (1904); and *Ritual in Catholic Worship* (1906). He has likewise edited the anonymous *Short Lives of the Dominican Saints* (London, 1900); T. A. Drane's *Spirit of the Dominican Order* (1897) and *Daily Life of a Religious* (1898); and M. E. Capes' *Flower of the New World* (1899), and has translated Savonarola's *Triumph of the Cross* (1901) and St. Thomas Aquinas' *Apology for the Religious Orders* (1902) and *The Religious State, the Episcopate, and the Priestly Office* (1902).

PROCURATOR: In general, one who acts as agent or factor for another in temporal interests. The term was anciently applied to lawyers in the civil courts and to proctors in ecclesiastical judicatories. As a secular calling it was forbidden to the clergy by a series of synods beginning with the First Synod of Carthage (348, chaps. viii.–ix.) and coming down to the Synod of Mainz (813, chap. xiv.). In case one who followed the profession desired to enter the clergy, he was required first to purge himself from participation in the duties which his profession involved. The clergy were repeatedly enjoined to abstain from labors of this sort, the only exception being service in behalf of widows or orphans, that intrusted to them by their bishop, or where the property of the church was concerned. In church life the term seems to have been applied to those who had charge of the temporalities. It was also applied to those who represented a person in absence during the ceremony of marriage or betrothal, as well as in some other ecclesiastical ceremonies.

PRODICIANS: A sect of Antinomian Gnostics, founded in the second century by Prodicus, a heretic of whom no definite information has come down. They claimed, as the sons of the most high God (not of the demiurge), and as a royal race, to be bound by no laws. They rejected the Sabbath and all external ceremonies as something fit only for those who stood under the sway of the demiurge. As their authorities, they quoted some apocryphal writings of Zoroaster.

PROFESSIO FIDEI TRIDENTINÆ. See TRIDENTINE PROFESSION OF FAITH.

PROLES, ANDREAS: German Augustinian; b. at Dresden Oct. 1, 1429; d. at Kulmbach (48 m. n.e. of Nuremberg) June 5, 1503. After completing his education at Leipsic, he entered the Observantine Augustinian order at Himmelpforte, near Wernigerode, in 1450, and was ordained priest three years later. He was directed to study at Perugia for a year and a half, and then taught theology in the monastery at Magdeburg until 1456, when he became prior at Himmelpforte. Here he maintained the union of the five Observantine monasteries of Himmelpforte, Magdeburg, Dresden, Waldheim, and Königsberg in Franconia, securing a renewal of the papal sanctions and privileges. Proles himself was elected vicar in 1460 or 1461, but the machinations of one of his subordinates resulted in a papal bull that the Observantine monasteries be subject to the provincial of Saxony. At the expiration of his term in 1467, he taught at Magdeburg for six years, and then was reelected vicar, this time holding office for thirty years. With unwearying energy, and appeals to the secular arm, Proles reformed monastery after monastery despite the resistance of monks and provincials alike. In 1475 he was forbidden by the Augustinian general to discharge the functions of vicar, while the reformed monasteries were returned to their provincials; and in 1476, as he refused compliance, he and his followers were placed under the ban of the general. Proles appealed to the pope, the result being the annulment of all edicts against him and the renewal of the privilege of Observantine reunion. In 1496, after further struggles, the Saxon, or German, congregation of Observantine Augustinians was fully recognized, and its delegates were accorded equal rights at the general chapters with those of the provinces of the order. In course of time he thus reformed and incorporated with his congregation about thirty monasteries, the most important in all Germany. Proles was gladly consulted by princes regarding secular affairs, and likewise furthered the intellectual development of his monks, as well as their talents as preachers. He himself was a distinguished preacher, and in 1530 the Dominican Petrus Sylvius issued some of his sermons, with, at least, partial revision. (T. KOLDE.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Accounts of the life were written by C. Schöttgen, Dresden, 1737; G. Schütze, Leipsic, 1744; and H. A. Pröhle, Gotha, 1867. Consult also: T. Kolde, *Die deutsche Augustinerkongregation und Johann von Staupitz*, pp. 96 sqq., Gotha, 1879; E. Jacobs, in *Geschichtsquellen der Provinz Sachsen*, xv. 478 sqq., Halle, 1882; *KL*, x. 460–461.

PROLOGUS GALEATUS ("Helmeted Preface"): The name given by Jerome himself to the first published and most celebrated of his prefaces, that prefixed to his translation of the Books of Samuel and Kings. The preface is important as setting forth the principles adopted by Jerome in his translations from the Hebrew. It contains also a brief general introduction to the Old Testament, describes

the contents of the three parts of the Palestinian canon, remarks upon the origin of the Hebrew alphabet, and makes a defense of his translations against the " mad dogs who bark and rage " against him. An English translation is given in *NPNF*, 2 ser., vi. 489–490.

PROPAGANDA, CONGREGATION AND COLLEGE OF THE: A congregation of cardinals and a college, both at Rome, for the implanting and extension of the Roman Catholic faith among pagans and heretics. Beginning with the thirteenth century missionary activity was carried on by various orders. Among these were the Jesuits, and Ignatius of Loyola formed the plan of founding " national colleges " for training missionaries, his idea being to educate young men from the very countries which were to be mission fields, so that they might be sent home as well-equipped champions of the Roman Catholic faith. Each of these institutions and every order concerning itself with missions independently cultivated the field of activity assigned it. On June 21, 1622, however, Gregory XV., the first pupil of the Jesuits to ascend the papal throne, created a congregation of cardinals *De propaganda fide*, in which was centralized the entire system of missionary labor.

When the Propaganda plans to begin operations within a certain district, which must first have received thorough geographic or ethnographic delimitation, a number of missionaries, furnished either by a religious order or by the national colleges, are sent there under the charge of a prefect apostolic, whence the district in question is termed an apostolic prefecture. All who are thus commissioned are priests, and their first object is to establish in their prefecture fixed missionary centers either for individuals or for small groups of their number. To every such station is also allotted a subdivision of the district as a prospective parish. In case the enterprise thrives, new parishes are detached; but even though such progress may be made that clergy may be trained either wholly or in part from the converts among the population without drawing priests from without, no new diocese is created until it may safely be assumed that it will be permanent. Instead of establishing a see, the apostolic prefecture is now made an apostolic vicariate, in which the pope, who is bishop there in his capacity of universal bishop, is represented by a bishop *in partibus*, or vicar apostolic. This prelate, like the prefect apostolic, may be removed at any time. In course of time, the apostolic vicariates are still further subdivided, since smaller districts facilitate more energetic activity; and finally, if all goes well, a bishopric is organized.

The situation and object of the missionaries not only dispense them from the minute observance of many rules of habit, breviary prayers, precise times of saying mass, and the like, but also from requiring rigid obedience on the part of their converts to the rules of life laid down by the Roman Catholic Church; and certain concessions may be made to divergent popular customs or similar factors, as in the case of fasts, impediments to marriage, etc. In both these directions, even as early as the thirteenth century, those in charge of missions were empowered with manifold privileges, or " faculties," which the Propaganda now confers upon its missionaries either as the mouthpiece of the pope or on the ground of unrestricted papal authority. Naturally no unnecessary faculties are conferred, and they are also generally limited to a certain number of years, their continuance being determined by the persistence of the conditions which originally evoked them. Here the determining factor is the attitude assumed by the State toward the Church, since from the Roman Catholic point of view the relative subordination of canonical rule to expediency can not entirely cease until the State undertakes its proper duty of maintaining the ordinances of the Church. Until this point is reached, the Propaganda directs its efforts to the desired end, and accordingly governs local church concerns. When, however, the State renders due aid to the Church, and the region in question has become wholly " Catholic," the Propaganda is replaced by the Inquisition. Where the latter is able to maintain pure doctrine and a corresponding mode of life with the full cooperation of the State, the territory in question is termed " Catholic "; but where, on the contrary, heresy revels unpunished, the land is regarded as a missionary district, and consequently as a " province of the Propaganda," since all church affairs are there controlled more or less by missionary motives. In modern times the distinction between the two is little more than a historic survival, since even in " Catholic lands " the aid formerly given by the State is being withdrawn. Nevertheless, a sharp difference is still observed by the Curia in the hope that recalcitrant States may return to their allegiance to the Church and again aid in the suppression of heresy.

Certain lands once " Catholic " have now become missionary districts through the continued recalcitrancy of their governments. Although this category includes primarily the Protestant countries, it also comprises the regions controlled by the Greek Church, despite the fact that they can scarcely be described as having once been " Catholic " in the technical sense of the term. Nevertheless, Pius IX. established, primarily for them, a special " Congregation for the Oriental Rites " (see under Roman Catholics, " Uniate churches "). The Greek countries are treated similarly to the Protestant missionary lands.

Roman Catholic dioceses in Protestant countries —these including the German sees, the reestablished English and Dutch bishoprics, and the newly founded North American dioceses—are missionary sees; and their bishops are, therefore, vested with pastoral care not only over the Roman Catholics, but also over the Protestants, in their dioceses. These bishops are, accordingly, under the constant supervision of the Propaganda, from which they receive the necessary missionary faculties. Some uncertainty exists as to whether the Curia regards such pre-Reformation sees as are partly conterminous with newly established dioceses as preserving a *de jure* continuity. It is clear, however, that dioceses which are still administered by prefects or vicars apostolic are held to have been uninterrupted by the Reformation.

E. Sehling.

Bibliography: O. Mejer, *Die Propaganda, ihre Provinzen und ihr Recht*, 2 parts, Göttingen, 1852–53; Raphael de Martinis, *Juris pontificii de propaganda fide*, Rome, 1888 sqq.; A. Pieper, *Gründung und erste Einrichtung der Propaganda-Kongregation*, Munich, 1901; P. M. Baumgarten, *Der Pabst, die Regierung und die Verwaltung der heiligen Kirche in Rom*, pp. 353–368, Munich, 1904.

PROPERTY, ECCLESIASTICAL.

I. General History.
Res Sacræ (§ 1).
Res Religiosæ (§ 2).
Changes at the Reformation (§ 3).
Jesuitical Theories (§ 4).
Territorialism and Collegialism (§ 5).
Distribution and Administration (§ 6).
The State and Church Property (§ 7).
II. In the United States.
1. Attitude of the States to Church Property.
2. Methods of Holding It.
3. American Rule of Specific Trusts.
4. Property and Church Divisions.
Secession from Denomination (§ 1).
Schism in Local Church (§ 2).
Particular Cases (§ 3).
Self-governing Churches (§ 4).

I. General History: Every Church requires external means of existence, the so-called temporalities, in order to maintain its institutional organism; and these it derives either from contributions or from other property at its command. Such property constitutes the *patrimonium* or *peculium ecclesiæ*. Of such things (*res ecclesiasticæ*), those which are designated and accordingly consecrated for use in the sanctuary service are distinguished as *res sacræ*, *sanctæ*, *sacro-sanctæ*, for the reason that according to Roman law they are withdrawn from trade (*extra commercium*): under canon law they do indeed stand in the light of property, but subject to the rule that they shall never be convertible in any way contrary to the sanctuary purpose to which they were once applied. Any crime committed against them bears its own stamp as such. To this category on the Protestant side belong church buildings, cemeteries, and church furniture; on the Roman Catholic side, the same as prior to the Reformation, the churches, the altars, the utensils accessory to the worship, especially to the Mass or Holy Communion; such as the chalice and paten, which are to be wrought of precious metals,—contingently of tin,—but not of wood or glass; the Eucharistic cruets (*ampullæ*); likewise the monstrance (*ostensorium*), for the reservation of the consecrated host, which on festival occasions is exposed for adoration; the censers (*thuribula*), crucifixes, images, lights, holy water basin, sprinkling brushes, banners, etc.; the sacred vestments; and bells.

1. Res Sacræ.

When the Church was first recognized by the Roman State it was already in possession of property. Constantine decreed (321) that the churches might inherit through testamentary provisions; and similar principles obtained in the German realms.

The individual ecclesiastical foundations were regarded as titular possessors of this ecclesiastical estate, prior to the Reformation. In a natural sense, only man can be the possessor of rights; hence, also, of property rights. Legal construction, however, can think of an enduring purpose as property-holder: for instance, the purpose that at a specified place and by a specified succession of persons the cure of souls shall be constantly exercised through the administration of word and sacraments; or the purpose that certain persons shall live together according to the rule of a certain order to the glory of God (the medieval term for property devoted to this end is *res religiosæ*, from *religio*, in the sense of "monastic life," "monastery"); or the purpose of healing the sick or caring for the poor; or that masses be read, or perpetual lamps be maintained, etc. The nature and course of the purpose in question are always defined. The legally effective arrangement by virtue of which this kind of ideal property-holder is qualified to stand as a so-called legal personality is called foundation or endowment; and in fact the like personalities themselves are then designated as foundations or endowments: church foundations, cloister endowments, hospital foundations, etc. If in the case of medieval donations and legacies the patron saint is named instead of the institution, this is only a popular expression. Again, where the idea occasionally expressed itself in earlier times that the subject of church property in the diocese was the metropolitan church, there is simply a product of the conditions whereby in the small Eastern episcopal provinces that church was the only parish church with full prerogatives.

2. Res Religiosæ.

This is not the place to take up in detail the obscure fancies that Christ, or the poor, are "owners of the Church's property"; however, the question is pertinent as to how the Reformation idea is related to the foregoing pre-Reformation views. The answer appears in the contemporary visitation minutes and church regulations, which latter nearly always contain a section with respect to church property. They both assume that the possessors of church property prior to the Reformation, namely the local parochial foundations, continue in possession, after the Reformation in so far as effective, of all the property rights to them belonging before the Reformation. They both strive to safeguard for them the prerogatives which belong to them under this construction, against the manifold injuries wherewith they were threatened on account of confusing Reformatory misconceptions. It is obvious that a good many aspects of church property before the Reformation ceased with the Reformation: above all, the fraternity foundations that were frequently attached to town churches, mass endowments, vicarages, endowments of perpetual lamps, etc., because their very object was lost. The property conditions in question might have been diverted to the State exchequer as *bona vacantia;* but in consequence of Luther's tract on "Spiritual Possessions" (*Ordnung eines gemeinen Kastens, Rathschlag, wie die geistlichen Güter zu handeln sind*, 1523) they were nevertheless, in so far as not simply applied to the actually needy pastoral estate, reserved frequently for distinctly new foundations, in order to serve as additional means for church purposes, education, care of the poor, etc., the so-called poor-boxes (*Gotteskasten*), and the like.

3. Changes at the Reformation.

The property of the nunneries, after their purpose had lapsed, was indeed absorbed by the State; and yet by favor of statutory enactments it not infrequently became appropriated to the use of the Church and education. Thus also the Evangelical Church continued to hold fast the pre-Reformation conception with respect to the qualified owners of church property. It is incorrect to represent this Church as holding the idea that the congregation is to be regarded as the authoritative owner: what the statements which are adduced to this effect from the Reformation period really say, is merely that the church property shall accrue to the benefit of the congregation (cf. O. Mejer, *Lehrbuch des Kirchenrechts*, Göttingen, 1869, p. 421, note; K. Rieker, *Rechtliche Stellung der evangelischen Kirche*, Leipsic, 1893, pp. 196 sqq.).

4. Jesuitical Theories.

In opposition to the theory thus far considered, there now developed on the Roman Catholic side what had been formerly expressed only in the way of isolated views; namely, the opinion that the visible ecumenical Church, as represented by the pope, is the owner of the church property, and has made over their portions to the several ecclesiastical institutions only as usufruct: that it can accordingly withdraw the same in case the institution at issue should perish or degenerate. An opinion of this nature, which reflected the Jesuitical philosophy of the papal system, and has been also chiefly advocated by that persuasion, excluded not only the possibility that the property of extinct ecclesiastical endowments accrues to the State, but even attached a claim to property becoming subject to Protestant tenure. Equally to be rejected as contrary to judicial principles is the similarly erected theory of *dominium successivum* on the part of the Church ecumenical with respect to the property of the individual organization.

5. Territorialism and Collegialism.

Territorialism (q.v.) claimed for the State the supreme power (*summa potestas*) on earth; and naturally, also the power of administration over the property of its subjects; that is, "eminent domain" (*dominium eminens*). The older territorialism, by adopting the formula that the incumbent of the State Church government is owner of the church property, effects the transition to what at bottom is likewise consistently the present territorial theory, which represents the State Church in this very light (cf. Mejer, ut sup., p. 422, note 7; C. Meurer, *Begriff und Eigenthümer der heiligen Sachen*, i. 331 sqq., Düsseldorf, 1885; Rieker, ut sup., pp. 324 sqq.). In like manner the exponents of the second system which is based upon natural right (collegialism) acknowledge *jus eminens* on the part of the State, nor in this respect do they deviate in their practical net results from those of territorialism. But in other respects they naturally lay more stress on the rights of the *collegium;* and they further consider, with implicit bearings of necessity involved therein, the congregation as disposer of the church property rights.

6. Distribution and Administration.

At first all ecclesiastical revenues, including those accruing from contributions, were turned into a diocesan fund, out of which, in Italy, the bishop, the clergy, the church fabric, and the poor each received one fourth. In Spain they made only three portions: for bishop, clergy, church fabric, some other way of caring for the poor being devised. In Frankish lands, however, the unity of administration (though not that of property, which had ceased on account of the growth of country churches), continued intact until into the eighth century, but some particular incomes were divided. Later, as this collective system lapsed, the benefices grew up (see Benefice); likewise the bishop's particular income (*mensa*) and the church-fabric funds (see Fabrica Ecclesiæ) and endowments; while out of the *quarta pauperum* there arose the parochial charitable funds, or the poor were cared for by the aid of cloisters and other foundations. It was only in exceptional instances that church property affecting general ecclesiastical objects was administered under episcopal supervision; but the bishop's jurisdiction over church property resolved itself into a comprehensive right of visitation. In the main the matter continued to rest on this basis in later times.

7. The State and Church Property.

When the State does not proceed on the principles of territorialism, it can empower itself with no other prerogatives with respect to the property of ecclesiastical foundations, than such as it holds in relation to the property of legal persons in general. In the case of all private property, the State exercises the right of corrective measures to confine the operation and use of such property within the sphere of public welfare. Likewise, the State is obliged and empowered to see to it that property intended for uses of public importance be not withdrawn from its rightful purpose. Both these theories apply to church property. They first come to light when church foundations were prohibited, or restricted by the State, which opposed the acquisition of property by Mortmain (q.v.).

E. Sehling.

II. In the United States: 1. Attitude of the States to Church Property. The status of property within the United States that is devoted to the purposes of religion is based upon the unique relation of Church and State originating in the colonial period and developing through the period of national life. By the terms of the federal constitution ecclesiastical affairs in the several commonwealths are regarded as domestic relations, and as such are excluded from the jurisdiction of Congress and reserved to the several state governments. A number of endowments of both real and personal property had been created prior to the revolution and had received legal form by charters secured either directly from the British crown or from the provincial legislatures. After the revolution the validity of such endowments was recognized by the state courts. The policy of the states, however, toward the creation of new religious endowments was timid. There was a general fear of doing anything toward the re-creation of ecclesiastical establishments, and the state legislatures hesitated to invest religious bodies with any considerable capacity to hold property. The early statutes on this sub-

ject placed a very low limit upon the amount of property which might he held by any one religious organization. The public policy respecting the accumulation of property by religious bodies gradually became more liberal, and their legal facilitics were more adequately defined. The manner in which property may now be devoted to the purposes of religion, the title by which such property is held, and the powers of religious societies or their trustees over it, depend in each state upon the statutory enactments and also upon the nature of the conveyance and the character and legal form of the church organization seeking to hold it. There is a general harmony in the policies of the several states in the matter of the taxation of church property All of the states at the present time exempt property devoted exclusively to the purposes of religion from taxation, but not from special taxes levied in the form of assessments for local improvements. This exemption is not extended to property that is held by a religious body for investment and revenue and not actually used for purposes of religion. By statute in some jurisdictions the amount of land which may be held by religious corporations is still limited. Where a statute provides a limitation solely as to the quantity of land, these bodies are not limited as to the value of the property which they may hold. It depends upon the terms of the statute whether this limitation extends to unincorporated as well as to incorporated societies. Such a limitation applies only to single societies and not to religious denominations. It is the general rule applicable to all religious bodies that a conveyance of property in trust for the use of a certain church to certain trustees and their successors, invests their society with the legal title, and not with any beneficial interest; and the trustees have no power to transfer the title of the property from the body for whose use they hold it. The legal title must remain in them while they remain in office; and when they resign or are displaced, it will either remain in them or be in abeyance until their successors are chosen. In either case it is their duty to hold the property until some one is invested with authority to receive it.

2. Methods of Holding It: While the provisions for the holding of the property of religious societies or churches differ greatly in matters of detail, there are throughout the United States only five general methods in use: (1) where the churches themselves become corporations upon the execution and filing of articles of association or by securing charters in accordance with law as in Indiana and Pennsylvania; (2) where the churches are required to elect trustees, such trustees being constituted the corporation as in Maryland, Montana, and New Jersey; (3) where, as in Virginia and West Virginia, trustees are appointed by the courts for the churches in order to secure their property rights; (4) where, as in the Roman Catholic Church, the property is held by the bishop or archbishop of the diocese. An official thus holding church property may be regarded as a corporation sole, although in some of the states he would not be so regarded. Delaware has legislation prohibiting this method of holding church property. In certain states, however, as in Oregon, special legislation has been secured permitting this method. (5) Church property in the United States is still sometimes held by unincorporated churches. If they have no trustees it is doubtful whether lands can be granted by deed to them, but it would appear that they may receive both real and personal property by will. Every effort is made by the courts to protect the property rights of such churches.

3. American Rule of Specific Trusts: While all property devoted to the purposes of religion is, broadly speaking, trust property, to some property there are attached specific trusts. Property which by deed or by will of the donor, or by other instrument, is held for the express purpose of teaching some specific form of doctrine, or for any other religious object, can not be diverted from such purpose or object, so long as there are any persons willing to carry out the objects of the trust, or who, having a standing in court, are prepared to insist upon the execution of the same. For instance, a trust created to support the teaching of the Presbyterian system of doctrine, or for the maintenance of a home for the orphans of deceased Baptist ministers, can not be diverted to any other purposes. If, in the case of a given specific trust, the trustees fail, the courts, if applied to, will provide new trustees, and will carry into effect the intent of the donor or testator so far as the same can be ascertained.

4. Property and Church Divisions: The rules regulating ecclesiastical property rights in cases of schism have been developed by the civil courts, both state and federal, in a series of notable cases, and may be summarized as follows: if a church acquires property when it is connected with a denomination as a subordinate branch of such denomination, it loses title to the property so acquired by severing its connection with the denomination. This rule is not to be interpreted, however, as meaning that no congregation can change any material part of its principles or practises without forfeiting its property. Individual members who, disapproving of the use of the property for the denominational purposes for which it was acquired, voluntarily leave the society and enter into another, must be regarded as abandoning their rights and privileges in respect to such property. But a majority of a congregation excluded from the church building by a minority and holding its meetings in another place does not thereby secede where it forms no new congregation and maintains the same officers and is recognized as the original church by the council of the denomination. Nor do the members of a faction withdraw from the church by supporting only their own organization (holding separate services) at separate times under another pastor and attempting to discharge the original pastor. The mere fact that the members withdrawing from the control of the supreme body of the denomination preserve identical theological belief and religious observances with those of the body from which they withdraw does not prevent them from losing title to the property.

1. Secession from Denomination.

In case of a schism in a church which is in connection with and a constituent part of an ecclesiastical organization and which has a head invested

by its constitution or recognized usage with supervisory and supreme control over the constituent parts to determine all questions producing schisms and division between the members and to recognize and decide what faction is in the right, the civil courts have laid down the following rule: The title to the property is in that part of the congregation which is acting in harmony with its own law, and with the ecclesiastical laws, usages, customs, and principles which were accepted among them before the dispute began. In such cases it is the duty of the civil court to decide in favor of that faction, whether a majority or a minority, which adheres to the doctrines maintained by the congregation. The only exception to this rule is the case of a usurpation of power in the governing body so revolutionary in its character as to result either in the creation of a new and essentially different organization or in such a radical change of the articles of faith as to constitute an essentially different religion.

2. Schism in Local Church.

Where there has come to be a voluntary division in the denomination where the controlling ecclesiastical authority of the denomination allows each congregation to decide for itself to which branch of the division it will adhere, this question is to be determined according to the vote of the majority, and the minority can not therefore retain control of the property on the ground that such action of the majority constitutes a diversion. The particular church may also refuse to adhere to either branch and will not thereby lose its title to property which has been specifically conveyed to it. The rule as to chapels and other subordinate organizations founded in connection with a congregation or parish is that they will not be allowed to secede from the church by which they were established and carry with them the property acquired in part or in whole by the contributions of the parent church or its members, or that which persons not connected with either organization may have given for its support as an adjunct, to the parent church. In cases where property is purchased by a congregation or society to be held for its benefit free from the interference and control of the denomination at large, the ownership of the property is in the congregation or society and will remain with the majority in case a minority secedes and develops a separate organization. The fact that persons not members of the church or society contributed to the fund which was used by it in the payment of land sought to be impressed with a trust for charitable uses does not make them owners of the land itself, nor authorize them to impose restrictions on the right of alienation, the church not being a mere owner under a donor for charitable uses, though the grantor as to the balance of the price was a donor. When a church which has withdrawn from its denomination returns to its ecclesiastical connection it is not thereby reinstated in its former property rights.

3. Particular Cases.

Many American churches are strictly congregational in their polity, each being governed solely within itself either by a majority of its members or by such other local organization as it may have instituted for the purpose of ecclesiastical government, its property being held either by way of purchase or donation with no specific trust attached. In such cases where there is a schism which leads to a separation into distinct and conflicting bodies the rights of such bodies to the use of such property must be determined by the ordinary principles which form voluntary associations. If the majority rules, then the numerical majority of members must control the right to the use of the property. If, however, the power and control are vested in officers of the congregation, then those who adhere to the acknowledged organization by which the body is governed are entitled to the use of the property. The minority in choosing to separate into a distinct body and refusing to recognize the authority of the governing body can claim no rights in the property from the fact of their membership in the church or congregation. As there was no trust imposed upon the property when purchased or given, the court will not imply one for the purpose of expelling from its use those who by regular order or succession constitute the church merely because they have changed in some respects their religious views.

4. Self-Governing Churches.

GEORGE JAMES BAYLES.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: B. Hübler, *Eigenthümer des Kirchengutes*, Leipsic, 1868; J. S. Mill, *State Interference with Church Property*, in *Dissertations and Discussions*, 4 vols., London, 1859–75; W. Strong, *Relation of Civil Law to Church Property*, New York, 1875; R. P. Day, *Fixtures as applied to Eccles. Benefices*, Canterbury, 1899; C. Meurer, *Bayerisches Vermögensrecht*, 2 vols., Stuttgart, 1892–1900; A. Poschl, *Bischofsgut und Mensa episcopalis*, Bonn, 1909; *Archiv für katholischen Kirchenrecht*, xxxiv. 50 sqq., lxi. 255 sqq.; *KL*, vii. 691–715.

PROPHECY AND THE PROPHETIC OFFICE.

I. Ethnic Prophecy.
General Conceptions (§ 1).
Biblical Attitude toward Soothsaying (§ 2).
II. In the Old Testament.
1. Historical Development of Prophecy.
Prophetic Basis of Old-Testament Religion (§ 1).
Samuel to Elisha (§ 2).
Amos to Malachi (§ 3).
2. Characteristics.
Objective View (§ 1).
Subjective Conditions (§ 2).
Objectivity of the Message (§ 3).
Delivery of the Message (§ 4).
Form of the Message (§ 5).
Contents (§ 6).
Relations of Prediction to the Present (§ 7).
Fulfilment (§ 8).
III. In the New Testament.

I. Ethnic Prophecy: Among many peoples the idea that God's spirit speaks directly to man was commonly held. Some early sages attribute to man's soul the faculty of premonition (Plato, *Phædo*, xx.; Cicero, *De divitatione*, i.; Plutarch, *De oraculorum defectu*, xl.). It was also believed that sometimes a divine power comes over a man and speaks through him. From the ecstatic state (see ECSTASY) in which this occurs, the seer bears the name *mantis* from *mainesthai*, "to rave." This, however, differs entirely from Hebrew prophecy; it were better to discover divine inspiration in poets, artists, and philosophers, but this gift is more ethical than religious. In man's intellectual life,

1. General Conceptions.

phenomena were observed that were independent of his conscious thought, especially in the frequently realized premonitions. In some cases, as with the *daimonion* of Socrates, these were connected with the conscience and had a certain ethical value. Persons at the point of death were also supposed to possess this faculty. Especial stress was laid on dreams or trances, survivals of which may be found in modern times, as also on communications from the spirits of the departed. These spirits were evoked among various peoples—Babylonians, Egyptians (cf. Isa. xix. 3), Canaanites (Deut. xviii. 11–12), Persians, Thracians, Greeks (*Odyssey*, xi. 29 sqq.), Romans, and others. Cicero distinguishes between artificial and natural divination, but the latter is rare and it is known that prophetic dreams and the ecstatic state were induced by artificial means (G. Ebers, *Aegypten und die Bücher Mosis*, i. 321–322, Leipsic, 1868). External nature was also a source of inspiration. The noblest form was that of the sighing of the wind or the murmuring of the stream, conceived as the voice of God, as in Dodona. However, communications from this source necessarily lacked the precision and clearness of the divine word of the prophet. In Delphi, the Pythia's inspiration seems to have come from subterranean vapors; her obscure words were interpreted by priests who bore the name of *prophētai*. With the Babylonians, the starry heavens were thought to have a determining influence on man's destiny (cf. Cicero, *De divinatione*, ii. 58, 60, 69). The casting of lots (see Lot, Hebrew Use of) to determine doubtful questions was also prevalent, and this, as well as dreams, was sometimes used by God to reveal his will; the Urim and Thummim (q.v.) may have been a kind of lot.

2. Biblical Attitude toward Soothsaying.

With the exceptions just mentioned, the Bible opposes all these heathen means of reading the future; magic and soothsaying were punished by death (Lev. xx. 27). By Magic (q.v.) is understood an attempt on man's part to utilize demonic powers (but see Comparative Religion, V. 1, b, § 5). There were magicians who called up the spirits of the dead (I Sam. xxviii.), also those who drew their conclusions from the movement of the clouds (cf. Isa. viii. 19; Jer. xxvii. 9). It is, however, principally by its contents that Old-Testament prophecy differs from heathen soothsaying, since with the latter, the main object is to gain information regarding the future. Without denying the ethical and religious quality of some of the Delphic oracles, it is still to be noted that these do not surpass the natural powers of human consciousness, while they fail to give any insight into the counsels of the Almighty. While analogies for the Messianic prophecies may be found in the ideal pictures of the future from heathen sages, the absolute confidence in the ultimate realization of their ideals is lacking. The religion of ancient Egypt, and more especially that of Zoroaster (see Zoroaster, Zoroastrianism), with its conflict between good and evil, resulting in the ultimate triumph of the former, approach Hebrew prophecy much more closely; but the conceptions are more abstract than those of the Bible, which sees in daily life the beginning of the realization of God's promises. According to Renan, prophecy was a special endowment of the Semitic mind, but, although this is true to a certain extent, there is no real analogy to Hebrew prophecy among the other Semitic peoples. The Koran possesses but little originality and lacks the high ethical worth characteristic of the true prophets. The Babylonian penitential psalms (Schrader, *KAT*, 3d ed., pp. 384–385), sometimes adduced as a prototype of the suffering servant of Yahweh, show a king who bewails his sufferings and asserts his innocence, but there is no trace of a plan of God which is served by this suffering, or indeed of any prophetic thought.

II. In the Old Testament: The Old Testament records the visions of men who were not Israelites, such as Eliphaz (Job iv. 12 sqq.) and Balaam (Num. xxii.–xxiv.), and also of the prophets of Baal and Ashera. In Israel, however, prophecy attained an incomparable significance, for here clairvoyance was ennobled by being used in the service of God; the mantic frenzy lost its pathological character and the prophet became the proclaimer of the purest religious truth and of the profoundest mysteries of God's kingdom. Prophetism in the service of Yahweh was the medium through which the national religion of Israel was called to life, and it guarded the purity of this religion against popular corruption and prepared the way for its development into the supreme religion of mankind.

1. Historical Development of Prophecy: It is significant for the entire conception of God in the Old Testament that, from the beginning, the Israelites derived their knowledge of him from personal revelations, appearances, and monitions. Genesis teaches that the patriarchs were honored with such revelations. Friends of God like Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, received prophetic direction at critical periods of their life. More especially the beginnings of the religion of the covenant are the work of a man of high prophetic gifts, a mediator between God and his people. The authority of Moses (q.v.) rested on his reputation as the servant of Yahweh, as the seer and spokesman of his God. Miriam and others possessed the gift of prophecy (Ex. xv. 20; Num. xi. 25 sqq.). From this time prophecy never wholly died out (Deut. xviii. 9 sqq.); in the time of the judges, Deborah and others appeared (Judges iv. 4, vi. 8, cf. ii. 1; I Sam. ii. 27). Samuel (q.v.) marks an epoch; he is called the seer, not in the lower sense of soothsayer, but as a tried and trusted organ of Yahweh. He may be regarded as the first of the prophets, both because of his superior endowments and because the prophetic communities seem to have owed their origin to him; at least, they first appear in his time. As their name ("sons of the prophets") indicates, they were disciples who gathered about a master; as communities they seem to have remained in their respective settlements, while such masters as Samuel, Elijah, or Elisha, wandered from place to place. These settlements appear to have been in the quiet country outside the city limits; a few lightly constructed huts, in a place offering a supply of water and veg-

1. Prophetic Basis of Old-Testament Religion.

etable growth, sufficed for the simple needs of these people. The sitting of the disciples before the master (II Kings, iv. 38) indicates a preaching or teaching activity on the master's part. Ecstatic phenomena (see ECSTASY) are not to be regarded as habitual with them, but represented a stage in the development of prophecy which might be compared with the revival meetings of modern Christianity. Samuel, Elijah, and Elisha were certainly in intimate relation with the "sons of the prophets," a fact which proves the high worth of the latter. Sacred music was cultivated in the communities (I Sam. x. 5) and served to induce the ecstatic state; it could also awaken the higher prophetic sense (II Kings, iii. 15). On the other hand, these schools may have contributed to the degradation of prophecy by making it more professional.

Individual prophets continually appear in the time of the kings as spokesmen of the King of kings. In David's time, the prophets were in perfect accord with the sovereign; Samuel had anointed him and Nathan and Gad aided him with their counsel (cf. II Chron. xxix. 25). To a prophet, the education of Solomon was entrusted. In his reign the prophet Ahia of Shiloh predicted the destruction of the Davidic kingdom and anointed Jeroboam king over the ten tribes. The authority of the prophets is also shown in the case of Rehoboam, who refrained from a campaign against the revolting tribes because the prophet Shemaiah declared their revolt an act of God (I Kings xii. 21 sqq.). The worldly character of most of the rulers of the Ephraimite kingdom evoked the heroic qualities of the prophets of Yahweh. When under Ahab and Jezebel the plot was laid to substitute for Yahweh's worship that of Baal, the prophetic caste opposed the design and suffered bloody persecution, and finally Elijah (q.v.) frustrated the entire plan. This prophet towers above all the others of his time; his hairy mantle seems to have become the prophetic garb (Zech. xiii. 4, A. V margin; cf. Matt. iii. 4, xi. 8). It appears also, that at that period the prophets bore a sign or scar on their foreheads (I Kings xx. 38); according to a much later source, on the chest (Zech. xiii. 6, A. V. "hands"); this indicates self-inflicted wounds (I Kings xviii. 28). The most trusted disciple and successor of Elijah was Elisha (q.v.). It appears (II Kings iv. 23) that he gathered a community about him on new moons and sabbaths, doubtless for teaching and edification. This formed a center of worship independent of the sanctuary at Bethel (II Kings iv. 42). As a consequence of Elijah's reforming activity, Elisha led a more quiet life, but he completed his predecessor's work.

2. Samuel to Elisha.

The political successes of the kingdom of Israel under Jeroboam II. served to estrange the people from God, and under this prince arose the prophets of misfortune, Amos and Hosea (qq.v.), who laid bare the moral perversity of the time and prophesied the destruction of the kingdom. Amos and Hosea differ from Elijah and Elisha in being exclusively bearers of the divine word, which they committed to writing, as became the custom from their time (see HEBREW LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE, II.). In the kingdom of Judah, the attitude of the prophets toward the monarchy was essentially different from that in Israel. Although they found unrighteousness in civil and political life, they found also a better ground upon which to build for the future. The house of David, with its fundamental promises and the choice of Zion as God's dwelling-place, gave hope and confidence, even in times of apostasy, that God's plans were being realized. There were also God-fearing rulers, willing to receive prophetic counsel, who sought to restore the pure and ancient religion of Yahweh. Thus II Chron. xv. 1 sqq. relates of Asa that he was influenced in this direction by the prophet Azariah, the son of Oded; Asa's successor, Jehoshaphat, sought the approval of God's word for his undertakings (I Kings xxii. 5). Early in the succeeding period, the writing down of prophecies in Judah must have begun. With the appearance of Isaiah and Micah (qq.v.), Judean prophecy reached its highest point; the former shows the action of the divine word in the whole history of the people, while both draw pictures of the future Messianic kingdom such as had never before been attained. There was a rich development of prophecy toward the period of the downfall of the kingdom of Judah; Nahum, Zephaniah, and Habakkuk (qq.v.) wrote during the passing of the empire from the Assyrians to the Babylonians. A prophetess, Huldah, enjoyed the highest consideration in the eighteenth year of Josiah (II Kings xxii. 14). Jeremiah (q.v.) was called by God to give prophetic testimony during the last struggle of the monarchy; while the somewhat younger Ezekiel (q.v.) was also greatly favored with visions by God; he was in perfect agreement with Jeremiah in the latter's judgments on kings and peoples. Besides these leading prophets, there was in Judah and Israel a prophetic gild, whose members Isaiah, Micah, and Jeremiah condemn on account of their conformity to popular clamor and their readiness to see divine inspiration in the dictates of sentimental patriotism, and also because of their indifference to the necessity of chastisement for moral perversity (cf. Isa. xxviii. 7; Mic. iii. 5 sqq.; Jer. xxiii. 9–40; Ezek. xii. 24). Among the Babylonian exiles there were optimistic dreamers who claimed to be prophets but were sternly condemned by Jeremiah (Jer. xxix. 8 sqq.). The visions of Daniel occupy an exceptional position, and because of the obscurity touching their origin were not included among the prophetic books of the canon. A notable prophet at the end of the captivity is the one usually designated as Deutero-Isaiah (see ISAIAH, II.). He realized that with the fall of Babylon and the victories of Cyrus the prophecies regarding Israel's liberation were beginning to be fulfilled, and he proclaimed the consummation of God's reign on earth. To the prophets Haggai and Zechariah (qq.v.) it is due that, in spite of all obstacles, the building of the Temple was energetically begun in 520. To the time of Ezra and Nehemiah belongs the last canonical prophet, Malachi (q.v.), whose diction is less lyric and more didactic. Great difference is observable in the attitude of the earlier and the later prophets regarding ritual observances; the former freely denounce the corrupt

3. Amos to Malachi.

and unspiritual worship to which their contemporaries were devoted; the latter, on the other hand, living at a time when the ritual had been purified and idealized, were more inclined to denounce any neglect to participate in it. Later Judaism looked upon Malachi as the last of the prophets. Even in the heroic age of the Maccabees, it was felt that prophecy had forsaken the land and that the only hope for its renewal lay in the future. Still, there were always those who either claimed or were supposed to possess this gift, as is shown in the pseudepigraphic apocalypses (see PSEUDEPIGRAPHA OF THE OLD TESTAMENT) and in what is related of the Essenes (q.v.).

2. Characteristics: According to Old-Testament ideas, the distinguishing quality of prophetic discourse consists in the fact that it results from the

1. Objective View.

action of a supernatural power which gives to the prophet of Israel the contents of his discourse; the words he utters are not his own, but those of God. Since the prophet is not free to follow his own inclination, but feels himself bound and led by an overmastering power, this is frequently called the "hand of God" (Isa. viii. 11; Jer. xv. 17; Ezek. i. 3; II Kings iii. 15), which comes over him, falls upon him, snatches him away from his accustomed range of thought and view, and brings him into connection with God. The power is often called the spirit of Yahweh, just as the prophet is said to be the man of the spirit (Hos. ix. 7, A. V margin). This spirit of the Lord is not to be confused with the universal divine spirit of life, dwelling in every human being, giving life and breath to even the brutes; it should rather be compared with that divine spirit which enabled members of the community, such as the judges or the artificer Bezalecl, to accomplish wonderful acts in the service of God (Ex. xxxi. 3, xxxv. 31). It is, therefore, necessary to distinguish various grades and also various gifts in this communication of the divine spirit. With the prophets, the spirit vouchsafed to them remains distinct from their natural consciousness and reveals itself in clear and definite announcements. The expressions used to designate its coming upon a man are "to come upon" (Num. xxiv. 2; II Chron. xv. 1), or, more forcibly, "fall upon" (Ezek. xi. 5). It is also said that this spirit clothes itself with a man as with a garment, and so makes him its corporeal envelope (Judges vi. 34). It is also said that the spirit "descends upon one," "rests upon him" (Num. xi. 25, 26; II Kings ii. 15; Isa. xi. 2); hence that the spirit of God "is upon" him (Isa. lxi. 1). Even where the spirit abides permanently, this relation had its beginning in a divine act which, as a rule, is neither coincident in time or fact with the bestowal of the universal spirit of life. The gift of prophecy is not hereditary, the privilege of a special gild or school. While members of the old prophetic societies prepared themselves to receive the spirit, it blew whither it listed. On the other hand, the spirit of prophecy came upon Amos, who was neither a prophet nor the son of a prophet (Amos vii. 14–15), and at once constituted him a prophet of divine quality Occasionally also, the spirit spoke through men who were not chosen for continuous teaching and preaching, such as David (II Sam. xxiii. 2); indeed, it sometimes seized upon persons whose mind was otherwise far removed from God, as when the Lord made the heathen seer Balaam his organ, and when the high priest Caiaphas spoke a word of the Lord (John xi. 51). The moment for revelation was always chosen by God, contrary to the practise in the heathen oracles and also to the use of the Urim and Thummim (q.v.), where the initiative came from the questioner. When counsel is sought, God often remains silent, but this does not exclude the fact that divine prophetic words are sometimes elicited later from the tried prophet (II Sam. vii. 2 sqq.). The prophet may also prepare himself to receive the divine word (Hab. ii. 1), even sensual means like music are not excluded; but whether the Lord will allow himself to be persuaded to speak, depends exclusively upon his grace. The receptive side of prophecy is sometimes designated as seeing and at others as hearing. The oldest name of the prophet was, according to I Sam. ix. 9, *ro'eh*, "seer." In this expression lies the conception that

2. Subjective Conditions.

the prophet whose eye God has unveiled gazes on those things that God usually hides from mortal sight; they may be symbolically represented to the eye of the seer, but even then he is not the creator of these signs and figures—this distinguishes him from the poet—but another intelligence presents them to him and their meaning is often only gradually revealed (cf., e.g., Zech. ii. 2 sqq., iv. 4–5). In the titles of some prophetic books (Amos i. 1; Isa. i. 1; Mic. i. 1; Hab. i. 1) prophetic words are said to have been "seen" by the prophet. E. König (*Offenbarungsbegriff*, ii. 192, cf. pp. 2 sqq., Leipsic, 1882) looks upon this as a figure of speech, a later modification of prophetic diction; he supposes that the verb *ḥazah* (in contradistinction to *ra'ah*) is not used in genuine prophetic passages for the reception of revelations by true prophets, but only in the case of false prophets, and that it "designates a process which takes place in man's inner consciousness" (ii. 30). But the verb *ḥazah* may be used for something objectively seen (Isa. xxx. 10; Ezek. xii. 27). The verb *ra'ah* signifies the relation of the eye to the object seen, while *ḥazah* indicates the continued gazing upon a picture or image, and therefore applies to prophetic vision in general. The fact must be emphasized that, after receiving the revelation, the prophets are able to give an exact account of what they have seen or heard. This distinguishes them from shamans, who make their disclosures in a state of trance. The prophets also retain their consciousness and the memory of the past during the revelation (cf., e.g., Ex. iv.–vi, xxxii. 7 sqq.; Isa. vi. 5; Jer. i. 6). An ecstasy, inducing a purely passive condition which assumed the characteristics of madness, sometimes appears in the case of the disciples of the prophets, or in that of a Saul (I Sam. xix. 24); but with those prophets who are familiar with the voice of the Lord this state is replaced by a certain self-control, which was necessary to enable them to apprehend clearly the word of the Lord and make it fruitful. Balaam, the half-heathen seer, the man with the "closed eye" ("whose eyes are open," A. V.), that

is, whose eyes are closed to the outer world, while to his prophetic gaze hidden and distant things are unveiled, bears the strongest likeness to the shamans; still, even he speaks with full consciousness of what he has seen. The individual characteristics of the prophets assert themselves in this particular. Judging from the emotion that still vibrates in his written words, Hosea was more powerfully affected physically than Haggai, for instance, and Ezekiel suffered more in this respect beneath the hand of the Lord than did Isaiah. In both Jewish and Christian theology much has been written on the psychical condition of the prophets. While the oldest patristic view, resting on Philo and Plato, lays stress on the ecstatic element, ecclesiastical theology since the Montanistic controversy (see MONTANUS, MONTANISM) has rather striven to exclude the idea of any abnormal psychical disturbance (cf. G. F. Oehler, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, pp. 745 sqq., Stuttgart, 1891). König believes that the communication of God to the prophets was always an audible one and expressly rejects the parallel adduced by Oehler and Riehm with the way God's spirit speaks to the Christian petitioner and assures him that his prayer is heard (cf. E. Riehm, *Die messianischen Weissagungen*, 38 sqq., Gotha, 1885, Eng. transl., *Messianic Prophecy*, Edinburgh, 1891; Oehler, ut sup., p. 764). He holds that if the revelation had been made to the inner consciousness of the prophets, they would have been unable to distinguish clearly the divine voice from that of their own hearts. This view, however, unduly limits the power of the divine spirit, and overlooks the fact that sensual impressions may as easily lead to self-deception—there are hallucinations both of sight and of hearing. With the Old-Testament prophets, the intrinsic majesty and sacredness of the revelation brought the conviction of its truth.

If the word of the Lord is something seen or perceived, something which comes to the prophet from without, it can not be the product of his subjective conjectures, fears, or premonitions.

3. Objectivity of the Message. While the false prophet calculates which result is the most probable and allows himself to be influenced by patriotism and personal advantage, the true prophet proclaims things contradictory to appearances and probabilities, things that offend his people and even deeply wound his own heart; yet he proclaims them with unshakable confidence. It must therefore be assumed that he had a higher source of knowledge. The ultra-rationalistic theology saw in the prophet only a man of superior gifts of mind and heart, a close observer of life, one familiar with virtue and hence with God, and one possessing that sure glance into the future which was lacking to the ordinary man. The difficulties to be overcome when an attempt is made to explain the duplex consciousness of the prophets and their boldness in the name of God, without having recourse to the intervention of a higher factor, is greatly increased by the quality of Old-Testament prophecy. This can not be explained by mere thought or by general convictions or simple premonitions.

The second act in the genesis of the prophetic word is its enunciation. This side of prophetic activity is most often expressed by the word *nabhi*, "the speaker," namely, for God (cf. C. von Orelli,

4. Delivery of the Message. *Alttestamentliche Weissagung*, pp. 7–8, Vienna, 1882; Eng. transl., *Old Testament Prophecy*, Edinburgh, 1885). The effort has been made to see in *nabhi*, according to its fundamental meaning, a designation of a Canaanite dervish and to distinguish it from *ro'eh*, supposed to signify the more noble seer. But apart from the doubtful equation, *nabhi* = madman, these bands of dervishes represent rather a degeneration of something higher. In Amos vii. 12 sqq., *hozeh*, the synonym of *ro'eh*, has already the same meaning as *nabhi*, and Amos himself (ii. 11–12) in no wise despises the *nebi'im*. The same spiritual power that has brought God's revelation with imperative certainty to the prophet's soul urges him to proclaim it to those to whom he is sent. This divine causation, which not only forces him to see but also to repeat what he has seen, is forcibly expressed in Amos iii. 8; that is, just as involuntarily as one starts in terror on hearing the voice of the lion, so must the prophet prophesy when God's mighty word comes upon him. When he tries to keep this word to himself, it burns his heart (Jer. xx. 9). False prophets indeed allow themselves to be influenced by human considerations and by the prospect of gain (cf. Mic. iii. 5, 11; Isa. lvi. 10); with the true prophet, however, "thus saith the Lord" means that a complete divine thought has been implanted in the prophet's being.

The concrete form and vivid realism of the relation springs from the fact that it describes a vision beheld by the prophet or some occurrence. He does not teach general, abstract truths, but

5. Form of the Message. his gaze is fixed upon the activities of the living God. This revelation first appears in an impressive form before the prophet's soul and it is only later combined with his own reflections. He may be morally disposed to expect, even to demand, a judgment upon Jerusalem, but what he prophetically beholds may be a visitation far in excess of what he believes reasonable. The form of prophetic inspiration depends upon the mental characteristics of the people and the race. A peculiarity of the Semites is a certain directness of perception; the single phenomenon is apprehended by them in immediate connection with its supreme cause. This natural gift was raised by the divine spirit to the potency of a *charisma* (cf. CHARISMATA) and herein lay the peculiar greatness as well as the limitations of Old-Testament prophecy; its greatness, in that it enabled the prophets to recognize the rule of God even in its external manifestations; its limitations, in that this incorporation of divine ideas is inadequate. As a rule, this revelation of God is designated as a word of Yahweh, and herein lies an important formal peculiarity. In that it is a word, the prophetic revelation is distinguished from the imperfect prototypes by which future persons and events are foreshadowed. The whole Mosaic sacrificial institution points to a future and perfect means of atonement; David, the king after God's heart, is the type of a future and greater ruler in whom the ideal which hovered before David will be fully realized.

The symbolical interpretation of the Bible, practised by both Jews and Christians from an early time, has fallen into disrepute because of the capricious way in which it was employed, but modern natural science fully recognizes in the lower primitive types a prefiguring of the later and higher ones. The prophet gives a language to these symbols and discloses their hidden sense. The high priest offered his sacrifice of atonement for centuries before any one saw in it a prophecy of the future, as did the Second Isaiah; sentiment and premonition were freely aroused by the symbolic worship, but they first became clear and definite ideas of the future through the prophetic word.

6. Contents.

As to its contents, prophecy is in no wise confined to future events. What happens at a distance and is therefore inaccessible to the senses, or what by its very nature belongs to a sphere unattainable for man's sensual and intellectual organs, is revealed to the prophet by the spirit of God. So, for example, Isaiah and Ezekiel beheld the majesty of him who was seated in the heavens; Ezekiel saw, in Babylon, what took place in Jerusalem (viii. 1 sqq.) or what Nebuchadnezzar did on the confines of Canaan. To the unsuspicious Jeremiah were revealed the plots laid against him by his fellow countrymen and even by his brethren. Nevertheless, the prediction of future events occupies an important place in prophecy. That the God who speaks through the prophets is he who determines all mundane events is proven according to the Biblical view by the fact that he reveals beforehand to his servants that which is to take place (Deut. xviii. 22; Amos iii. 7; Isa. xli. 22). The attempt has been made to limit this vision into the future to general ideas regarding the course of historical development, and to refer the special predictions which could not be thence derived to uncertain premonitions belonging rather to the domain of soothsaying. In this way Schleiermacher (*Der christliche Glaube*, Berlin, 1861) distinguishes in Old-Testament prophecy on the one hand actual predictions which possess a higher or lower degree of exactitude, on the other hand, Messianic prophecies in which the prophet rises from the particular to the general and where the statements rather belong to the realm of symbolism. In agreement with him it has been the custom to recognize only those ideas springing from general, ethical, and religious convictions regarding the future as the essentially divine part of prophecy. Here, however, something which appears in history as a living unity is arbitrarily divided. The sayings of the patriarchs, those of Balaam and similar predictions, may be explained as "predictions after the event"; but too many definite and well-authenticated predictions have been preserved from strictly historic times to make it possible to do away with them, and these are by prophets representing the highest level of Israelitic prophetism, when it must long have been purified from the mantic elements said to have accompanied its beginnings. Such are Isaiah's word against the Assyrians (xxxvii. 21), Jeremiah's announcement of the impending destruction of Jerusalem, and Ezekiel's story of the catastrophe in the capital city (xxi. 8 sqq., xxi. 18 sqq.).

7. Relation of Prediction to the Present.

That it is the God who rules in nature and history who manifests himself to his people for their spiritual and material consecration is the most important phase in prophecy. The oldest parts of Genesis see in God the creator of the universe, whose will and rule are not confined to the spiritual and moral sphere, who also forms the external world according to his free will; and the prophets tell us how this divine will transformed and will transform the universe until it fully conforms to him. For this living God everything is predestined; even the details of prophecy can not be fortuitous. Neither the enrichment of human knowledge, nor the mere attainment of earthly happiness, not to speak of lower needs, can be the aim of the prophets. The people indeed willingly sought them for counsel and aid (cf. I Sam. ix. 6 sqq.; II Kings iv. 40), but the genuine prophet only answered questions and petitions a reply to which served to make a deeper impression upon men to the honor of God. The less the will of Yahweh prevailed in the present, the more the prophets referred to its realization in the future; but they always spoke of the future kingdom of God in the forms and colors at their command. The pictures they drew were historically conditioned and limited, for prophecy had first to serve the realization of the divine will in the present and this is possible only when it is made comprehensible for the hearers of the time; the kingdom, therefore, is depicted according to local and national limitations, in which form the future appeared to the prophet. Often, however, this picture was so intensified by the spirit animating it that the temporal bounds constituting its framework yielded. Thus the prophets beheld the advent of Messianic salvation in the forms of their own time and place. For the prophets of the exile, for example, it was connected with the return from captivity, while the generation which experienced this return postponed the blessed "end of days" to the future. From what has been said, it results that prophecy has a history, wherein lies both its permanent contents and its progressive growth. The news of the future kingdom of God was not communicated to the people of God at one time and as a definite doctrine—they would not indeed have been able to receive it; but that side of the Messianic future was disclosed which it was possible and beneficial for them to behold. Hence epoch-making changes in the national life, such as the founding of the Davidic kingdom on Zion or the Babylonian captivity and the destruction of the Temple were not only predicted in the prophetic word, but also served as a starting-point for a new phase of prophecy and rendered possible its essential progress. Which side of prophecy should be most prominent depended upon changes in the external aspect of affairs, but also upon the moral level of the people; to a self-righteous people, proud of their good fortune, a judgment must be announced, by means of which God wills to prepare the way for his rule. This phase of prophecy is predominant from Solomon to the exile. For a chastened and humbled people, however, the consolatory promises of the blessed fruition of God's plans were to be pre-

sented. If, therefore, the direction taken by the prophetic sayings depended upon the ethical needs of each generation, its spiritual height was often conditioned thereby. Even though the prophecies are not a product of the spirit of the age, God's spirit speaks therein first to the community of the present, and an educational progress is unfailingly recognized, so that, according to the capacity of each generation, the revelation assumes a more spiritual or a more sensual form, and, in general, a more profound mental effort is required of the later generations, since their horizon has been enlarged and enriched by many experiences. Still, this progress is not in a direct line, for after periods of the highest elevation of prophetic knowledge, there follow times when its flight is lower. The personal quality of the individual prophet also influences his prophecy, for his relation to the divine inspirations is not that of a clear mirror from which the divine pictures are reflected. The liveliness and tendency of his imagination, the conceptions with which he was already familiar through his life and calling, appear in his writings.

Historical fulfilment belongs necessarily to genuine prophecy. It contains not merely abstract truths of permanent authority, nor simply ideals, the esthetic or religious value of which might depend on the degree of their realization in life, but, more especially, an outlook upon the works and plans of God in the world. Indeed, the divine word itself is conceived as something living and efficient. Therefore, the prophet, when he pronounces it, accomplishes, so to speak, a divine act; he is the organ of divine activity (Jer. i. 10, xxv. 15 sqq.). Hence realization is a requisite for the full acceptation of prophecy. In Biblical phraseology there is a reference to the fact that only after the realization of the prediction does the prophecy attain its true value and authority. God acknowledges his word in this way and redeems it. When God lets a prophetic word " fall to the ground " (I Sam. iii. 19), this proves its falsity (Deut. xviii. 21–22). The fulfilment differs, however, according to the character and purpose of the prophecy. Where the emphasis is laid upon the external form and a near term is indicated for a special judgment, whether of an individual or a people, it necessarily follows that the fulfilment must be literal, if the sayings are genuine. There are in the canon a great number of such predictions, the fulfilment of which is either expressly stated or is at least presupposed. Such prophecies became a sign that the Lord had spoken by the prophet. But these sayings do not always contain an unalterable judgment of God; indeed, as a rule, the menacing prophecy is intended to produce a change of the people's heart; if this purpose was attained, God's attitude was modified and his sentence was no longer to be executed (as in Jonah's experience with Nineveh, cf. Jonah iv. 2; Jer. xxvi. 18–19). (C. von Orelli.)

8. Fulfilment.

III. In the New Testament: The Lord himself announced that after his death prophets would arise, men who in the same way and with the same authority as the messengers of God in the Old Testament would present the truths of the approaching salvation to the people of Israel and urge them to decide either for or against them (Matt. xxiii. 34; cf. Luke xi. 49). The work of Jesus as well as that of his predecessor John was of a prophetic nature (Matt. xiii. 57, xiv. 5, xxi. 26; Luke vii. 16, xiii. 33, xxiv. 19). The testimony to the resurrection and exaltation of Christ as presented by the first Christian community bears a thoroughly prophetic character, and the first effect of the spirit of Pentecost was the prophesying of those believers who were suddenly and miraculously filled with its power. They spoke " as the spirit gave them utterance " (Acts ii. 4) and their word was corroborated by sayings and wonders (Acts iii. 6, iv. 30, v. 12, 15, 16); the judicial and awe-inspiring quality of this prophecy is revealed in the judgment of Ananias and Sapphira (v. 1–11). Several prophets arose from it, such as Stephen (although he does not bear this name), for whoever was chosen by the spirit of Christ as an organ for the communication of the truths of salvation was endowed with the special *charisma* of inspired speech (II Cor. ii. 14–17). New-Testament prophecy belongs to the period of the founding of the Church when faith especially needed the guidance and support of the spirit of Christ, and when the written word either did not yet exist or was not in general use.

Among those possessing the gift of prophecy, the Acts mention Agabus (xi. 28), who predicted in Antioch the great famine of 44–45 A.D. (Josephus, *Ant.*, XX., iv. 2), and in Cæsarea foretold to Paul the fate awaiting him in Jerusalem (Acts xxi. 10, 11), Barnabas, Symeon Niger, Lucius of Cyrene, Manaen and Saul of the Antiochian community (Acts xiii. 1), from whom came the command to dedicate Barnabas and Saul to the work for which they were called by the Holy Spirit. Judas and Silas, who were sent with Paul and Barnabas to Antioch to give verbal support to the epistle of the community, were also prophets, as were the four virgin daughters of Philip (Acts xxi. 9). The gift of prophecy was not, however, confined to individuals, but was wide-spread in the apostolic communities. When Paul enumerates in his epistles the gifts, offices, and powers of the church, he places the prophets in the second rank, immediately after the apostles. Prophecy, recognized as a spiritual gift, is to be preferred to the speaking with tongues, for prophecy traverses the mind of the speaker and is addressed to the mind of the hearer (I Cor. xiv.). Therefore, the apostle desired that, during worship, two or three prophets should stand up and speak, one after the other, according as the spirit moved them. To test the truth and the divine origin of such communications, the Church had the gift of the " discerning of spirits " (I Cor. xii. 10).

The Revelation of John was certainly intended to close the era of prophecy until the Lord's second coming. For after the death of the apostles, prophecy slowly gave place to the use of the New-Testament Scriptures, which became from that time, and are to-day, the norm and source of divine truth. The Montanist movement of the second century (see Montanus, Montanism) naturally produced in the Church a distrust of new prophets, and this appears with Luther at the time of the Reformation. The

prophetic word (II Pet. i. 19), which shines as a light in the darkness until the breaking of the new day, must suffice for the faithful. (KARL BURGER†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: An important literature is indicated under MESSIAH, MESSIANISM, especially the works of Briggs, Woods, Drummond, Kuenen, Riehm, Orelli, and Delitzsch. The reader is referred also to the lists of literature under the articles on the individual prophets, also to the literature in and under BIBLICAL THEOLOGY, especially the works of Oehler, Schultz, Bennett, and Davidson. Consult further: A. Knobel, *Der Prophetismus der Hebräer*, 2 parts, Breslau, 1837; F. B. Koster, *Die Propheten des A. und N. T nach ihrem Wesen und Wirken*, Leipsic, 1838; G. M. Redslob, *Der Begriff des Nabi bei den Hebräern*, Leipsic, 1839; A. Lee, *Inquiry into the Nature, Progress, and End of Prophecy*, London, 1849; J. Davison, *Discourses on Prophecy: its Structure, Use, and Inspiration*, new ed., Oxford, 1856; E. W. Hengstenberg, *Christologie des A. T.*, iii. 158 sqq., Berlin, 1857; C. Kohler, *Der Prophetismus der Hebräer und die Mantik der Griechen*, Darmstadt, 1860; G. F. Oehler, *Ueber das Verhältnis der alttest. Prophetie zur heidnischen Mantik*, Tübingen, 1861; P Fairbairn, *Prophecy, its Distinctive Nature, Special Function, and Proper Interpretation*, Edinburgh, new ed., 1864, reissue, New York, 1866; A. Tholuck, *Die Propheten und ihre Weissagung*, in the *Werke*, Gotha, 1867; A. Dillmann, *Ueber die Propheten des alten Bundes nach ihrem politischen Wirksamkeit*, Giessen, 1868; A. Le Hir, *Les Prophètes d'Israel*, Paris, 1868; A. Clissold, *The Prophetic Spirit, in its Relation to Wisdom and Madness*, London, 1870; E. H. Gifford, *Voices of the Prophets*, Edinburgh, 1874; C. Bruston, *Hist. critique de la littérature prophétique*, Paris, 1881; R. A. Redford, *Prophecy, its Nature and Evidence*, London, 1882; S. Maybaum, *Die Entwickelung des israelitischen Prophetenthums*, Berlin, 1883; C. von Orelli, *Old Testament Prophecy of the Consummation of God's Kingdom*, Edinburgh, 1885; Smith, *Prophets;* E. Havet, *La Modernité des prophètes*, Paris, 1891; W. H. Simcox, *Cessation of Prophecy*, London, 1891; J. Darmesteter, *Les Prophètes d'Israel*, Paris, 1892; G. Meignan, *Les Prophètes d'Israel*, 2 vols., Paris, 1893-1894; C. H. Cornill, *The Prophets of Israel*, Chicago, 1895; G. G. Findlay, *Books of the Prophets in their Historical Succession*, 3 vols., London, 1896–97; F. X. Leitner, *Die prophetische Inspiration*, Freiburg, 1896; F. Giesebrecht, *Die Berufsbegabung der alttestamentlichen Propheten*, Göttingen, 1897; A. F. Kirkpatrick, *The Doctrine of the Prophets*, London, 1897; R. Smend, *Alttestamentliche Religionsgeschichte*, 2d ed., Tübingen, 1899; A. Causse, *Le Socialisme des prophètes*, Montauban, 1900; E. Kōnig, *Das Berufungsbewusstsein der alttestamentlichen Propheten*, Barmen, 1900; idem, *Prophetenideal, Judentum, Christentum*, Leipsic, 1906; F. Walter, *Die Propheten in ihrem sozialen Beruf und das Wirtschaftsleben ihrer Zeit*, Freiburg, 1900; L. Gautier, *Vocations des prophètes*, Lausanne, 1901; R. B. Girdlestone, *The Grammar of Prophecy*, London, 1901; R. Krätzschmar, *Prophet und Seher im alten Israel*, Tübingen, 1901; W H. Lockwood, *The Prophets of Israel*, Chicago, 1901; A. B. Davidson, *Old Testament Prophecy*, Edinburgh, 1902; W. G. Jordan, *Prophetic Ideas and Ideals: short Studies in the prophetic Literature of the Hebrews*, Chicago, 1902; T. MacWilliam, *Speakers for God: Lectures on the Minor Prophets*, London, 1902; O. Procksch, *Geschichtsbetrachtung und geschichtliche Ueberlieferung bei den vorexilischen Propheten*, Leipsic, 1902; C. F. A. Lincke, *Samaria und seine Propheten*, Tübingen, 1903; Rose E. Selfe, *The Work of the Prophets*, London, 1904; L. W. Batten, *The Hebrew Prophet*, New York, 1905; Binet-Sanglé, *Les Prophètes juifs. Étude de psychologie morbide*, Paris, 1905; L. Franckh, *Die Prophetie in der Zeit vor Amos*, Gütersloh, 1905; P Kleinert, *Die Profeten Israels in socialer Beziehung*, Leipsic, 1905; E. A. Edghill, *The Evidential Value of Prophecy*, London, 1906; J. Réville, *Le Prophétisme Hébreu*, Paris, 1906; F. C. Eiselen, *The Minor Prophets*, New York, 1907; idem, *Prophecy and Prophets in their Historical Relations*, ib. 1909; G. Stosch, *Die Propheten Israels in religionsgeschichtlicher Würdigung*, pp. vii., 569, Gütersloh, 1907; P. de Buck, *De Profeten van Israel*, Rotterdam, 1908; W. H. Bennett, *The Religion of the Post Exilic Prophets*, new ed., Edinburgh, 1909; M. Jastrow, *Ro'eh and Hozeh in the O. T.*, in *JBL*, xxviii. 1 (1909), 42 sqq.; G. C. Joyce, *The Inspiration of Prophecy*, London, 1910.

PROPHESYING: A means of promoting the knowledge and understanding of the Scriptures by means of discussions in common became customary among some of the Reformed churches.

History of "Prophesying."

Although often confused with the reading and explanation of the Scriptures as practised during the Reformation, a certain kind of instruction in the Scriptures (called by the Germans *Prophezei*) has no connection with this. It first appeared in Zurich because of the need of winning such priests as possessed, besides sufficient knowledge of the Scriptures, the talent to explain in a familiar way the Christian message of salvation. According to the reformation of the foundation of the Gross Münster, every effort should be made for the appointment of those who should every day, publicly, for one hour, preach and teach the Holy Scriptures in the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin languages. On June 19, 1525, this regulation was put in force under the leadership of Zwingli. At eight o'clock each morning, excepting Fridays and Sundays, all the clergy of the city and the other preachers (students, chaplains, etc.), came together in the choir of the Gross Münster. After a short opening prayer, a part or the whole of a chapter of the Old Testament was read. The reading was followed by a dogmatic and practical exposition. These are the beginnings of the so-called prophesying. Megander introduced this custom in Bern, where it later developed into a school. With Peter Martyr (1556) followed the institution of the " theological lesson " for the people; prophesying was transformed into teaching. Encouraged by the example of Zurich, prophesying assumed a new and singular form in Lasco's fugitive community in London. One of their preachers, Micronius, relates, in 1554, that in the weekly prophesying, the Sunday sermons were subjected to a critical examination, so that the elders, doctors, and prophets could add thereto from the Scriptures whatever might be necessary for the understanding of the text and the edification of the congregation. This institution never attained great development as a liturgical element, since, on the one hand, the founding of theological schools took its place, and, on the other hand, the religious understanding of the congregation soon outgrew the need for its use.

Wherever religious excitement has demanded a more recondite explanation of Scripture, analogous phenomena appeared. For example, among the Jansenists of Port Royal, the study of the Scriptures was pursued in common, and from this circle Labadie transplanted the usage, in the form of a developed private worship, to Amiens (1644), Geneva (1659), and Middelburg (1666). Among his disciples in Geneva were Untereyk and Spener; the latter introduced the movement as *collegia pietatis* into Frankfort. From the time of Spener, prophesying, as modified by time, has endured in the Evangelical churches in the form of Bible conferences or of Bible lessons and readings, at home or in the church, and under the direction of members of the congregation or of the pastors or elders.

(EMIL EGLI†.)

PROPITIATION. See ATONEMENT.

PROPST (PROBST, PRÆPOSITUS), JAKOB: German reformer; b. at Ypres (30 m. s.s.w. of Bruges), Flanders, probably in the last decade of the fifteenth century; d. at Bremen June 30, 1562. He seems to have entered the Augustinian order at an early age, and soon became acquainted with Luther, whose pupil he was at Wittenberg in the beginning of 1519. In the same year he became prior at Antwerp, where he was active as a reformer. In 1521 he was again at Wittenberg, and on his return to Antwerp as provost found that his enemies had grown bolder. Luther's writings had been burnt and his followers imprisoned; Propst soon shared their fate. On Dec. 5, 1521, the imperial counselor, Franz van der Hulst, invited Propst to accompany him to Brussels. There every effort was made to induce him to recant, and after a long resistance he finally yielded, terrified by the threat of capital punishment (Feb. 9, 1522). The Protestants were much depressed at this event, especially Luther, although the latter pitied Propst and did not believe that he had really changed his views. Propst was now transferred to the Augustinian monastery of his native city, where he soon found sympathizers and again began a Protestant propaganda. Though he carefully avoided all polemics, his enemies grew suspicious, and he was brought back to Brussels. His execution seemed inevitable, but a fellow monk aided him to escape. After a time he found his way to Wittenberg, where he married a young woman closely connected with Luther's wife.

In May, 1524, Propst found an important sphere of activity when he was called to Bremen by his friend and fellow monk, Henry of Zütphen (see MOLLER, HEINRICH; and ZUETPHEN, HENRY OF), and given charge of the Liebfrauenkirche there. The Reformation was now carried out in Bremen; Protestant pastors were installed in the churches, and the Roman Catholic worship was forbidden, except in the cathedral; Propst became senior pastor with the title of superintendent. In 1532 a Protestant revolutionary movement, social rather than religious, which Propst and the other pastors did not regard with favor, resulted in his withdrawal from Bremen for a short time, but on his return he was able to labor for many years in peace. In 1535 he visited Cologne with Melanchthon, and in 1540 caused a Spanish merchant, Francisco San Romano, to embrace Protestantism and to spread his new doctrines in his native land. Although heartily in sympathy with the ideas of Luther, with whom he maintained an active correspondence, Propst was not a prominent figure in the eucharistic controversy begun by Albert Rizaeus Hardenberg (q.v.), even while energetically rejecting his doctrines. He accordingly gladly resigned in 1559 in favor of Tilemann Hesshusen (q.v.) and retired from public life. Subsequent events in Bremen, culminating in the supplanting of Lutheranism by Reformed tenets, he saw without being able to prevent.

(J. F. IKEN†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: H. G. Janssen, *Jakobus Präpositus, Luthers Leerling en Vriend*, Amsterdam, 1862.

PROSELYTES.

Meaning of Term (§ 1).
"Strangers in Israel" (§ 2).
Early Proselytism (§ 3).
Decline of Jewish Propaganda (§ 4).
Palestinian Proselytes (§ 5).
Status of the Proselyte (§ 6).
Hellenistic Proselytes (§ 7).
Significance for Early Christianity (§ 8).

The proselytes were converts from heathenism to Judaism. The Greek original of the term, *proselytos*, is not found in classical authors, and was evidently borrowed from colloquial speech by the Septuagint as an equivalent for the Hebrew *ger* (A. V., "Stranger," q.v.). In this sense *proselytos* occurs seventy-eight times as the translation of *ger* in the Septuagint, which does not use it to render any other word. On the other hand, the Aramaic *giyyora*, "stranger," is sometimes retained in the Greek versions (Ex. xii. 19; Isa. xiv. 1; Aquila, Lev. xix. 34); and elsewhere, where there is no allusion to proselytes in the technical sense of the term, *paroikos*, "sojourner, alien," is found (e.g., Gen. xv. 13, xxiii. 4; Ex. ii. 22, xviii. 3; Deut. xiv. 21; II Sam. i. 13), as well as *epelytos*, "incomer, foreigner" (Job xx. 26). The Syriac version frequently paraphrases the idea of "proselyte" as "he who is converted unto me." The term "proselyte" occurs four times in the New Testament (Matt. xxiii. 15; Acts ii. 10, vi. 5, xiii. 43); but in other early Christian literature the word is seldom found.

1. Meaning of Term.

In ancient Israel the *gerim*, or "strangers," were a class possessing a special status and belonging to another race which had for some reason entered the land of Israel and placed themselves under the protection of its people (see STRANGER). While there was a strongly marked and increasing tendency to make the "stranger" share in all the religious obligations and prerogatives of Israel, and even to become fully Judaized by circumcision, this was not proselytizing in the later sense of Judaism's extension beyond its boundaries, but rather marked the desire to avoid, so far as possible, any foreign elements within the bounds of Israel. A very late example of such seekers for protection is related by Josephus (*Life*, 23), in which the Jews made circumcision a necessary condition. In post-exilic times, however, such cases were rare; the weak Jewish community, under foreign domination, was not strong enough either to subject the numerous foreign colonists or to absorb them. Under the Maccabees, indeed, Idumeans, Itureans, and many Greco-Syrian cities were forcibly Judaized by circumcision. Nevertheless a number of Greek settlements remained in the land, and the Herodians and Romans also introduced many foreign elements into the country. It was of these aliens that the rabbis thought when they applied the laws of the Old Testament regarding the *gerim* in so far as these were referred, not to the proselytes, but to the "strangers in Israel." The latter were sharply distinguished from the proselytes, and were placed on a par with heathen and idolaters; and when the

2. "Strangers in Israel."

gerim were required to observe the seven "Noachian laws" (obedience to Jewish authority, and avoidance of blasphemy, idolatry, fornication, murder, theft, and the eating of meat not killed according to legal prescription), this was done to preserve the holiness of Israel. The Jews forgot, however, that they had to deal with their rulers, not with their supplicants, and the whole idea remained mere theory, though it seems to have influenced the rules for the association of Jewish and gentile Christians recorded in Acts xv. 20, 29, xxi. 25.

3. Early Proselytism.

Entirely different from the *gerim* of ancient times, with their peculiar legal and social isolation, were the proselytes of later Judaism, that is to say, the following which it gained as a religious community outside its own people and its own land. The earliest proofs of this are in Neh. x. 28 and Isa. lvi. 6. While at first the post-exilic community was exclusive, the tendency toward propaganda became evident in the period of the Maccabees, as when an embassy was sent to Rome in 139 B.C., only to be expelled by the prætor Hispalus because of attempts to win converts. The chances for and against such a propaganda were about equal; everything oriental exercised a potent spell at that period; the later philosophy was attracted by monotheism; and ethics and asceticism, as well as superstition, found satisfaction in all that was strange and exotic. Judaism, enjoying many imperial privileges, had also political advantages to offer. On the other hand, a strong pan-Hellenic party nourished an aversion to everything barbarian, and the Jews were in evil repute as traders and usurers, as magicians, and procurers. Their imageless worship was regarded as atheistic, and the wildest reports were circulated regarding them. The anti-Semitic movement was systematically fostered by the gymnastic societies of the larger Greek cities. Judaism was also something strange and foreign in the world of that time, and its exclusiveness seemed misanthropy (Tacitus, *Hist.*, v. 5). Nevertheless, the unshakeable consciousness of being the true religion that animated Judaism (cf. Rom. ii. 17 sqq.) overcame all obstacles. Its enormous success is attested by Josephus and classical authors, and was especially great among women. The reigning house of Adiabene was converted to Judaism; Helena was often in Jerusalem, as were her sons Izates and Monobazus, who also built themselves a tomb there. The Bible translators Aquila of Sinope and Theodotion of Ephesus were also believed to be proselytes. Legend even made a proselyte of the prophet Obadiah as well as of Israel's greatest enemies, and represented them as ancestors of famous families of proselytes. It was said that Shemaiah and Abtalion, the predecessors of Hillel and Shammai, were descended from such a family of Assyrian proselytes. Agrippa II., at the time of the marriage of each of his sisters, Drusilla and Berenice, required the circumcision of their husbands, Aziz of Emesa and Polemon of Cilicia.

4. Decline of Jewish Propaganda.

The time of Rabbi Akiba marks in a twofold sense the end of the Jewish propaganda. Judaism, thrown back upon itself, then began its process of petrification into the Talmud (q.v.), and with the rejection of Greek civilization it renounced all spread among the Greeks. On the other hand, Hadrian's edict against circumcision was suspended under Antoninus Pius only in the case of Jewish children, otherwise remaining in force as a part of Roman law, and so rendering any propaganda impossible. Conversion to Judaism or any attempt at proselytizing was punished by confiscation and exile, if not by death. There is not much significance in the fact that, at the time of the Christian persecutions, some individuals went over to the synagogue. History and legend of later times have but little to say in regard to conversions, though there are allusions to a monk of Sinai who was circumcised and took the name Abraham. The ecclesiastical and civil laws often treat of the enforced circumcision of Christian slaves in Jewish houses. It was only outside the Roman Empire, however, that the Jewish propaganda still had considerable success, as in the conversion of the Arab tribes in the region of Medina and especially that of the Himyaritic princes and of the Chazar Prince Bulan in the Crimea.

5. Palestinian Proselytes.

From the account given by Josephus of the conversion of Izates of Adiabene (*Ant.*, XX., ii. 3–4), it is evident that Jewish proselytizers followed two distinct methods, one type requiring complete adhesion with circumcision as the sign of the covenant, and the other being satisfied with a leaning toward Judaism and the observance of certain of its usages. In like manner there were two classes of proselytes: complete converts and quasi-converts, or circumcised and uncircumcised. This distinction may be paralleled with that found in Palestino-rabbinical Judaism as contrasted with Hellenistic Judaism. The former recognized as proselytes (or, more exactly, as "proselytes of righteousness") only those who had been fully received into the religious community of Israel by means of circumcision. On this view was based the judgment of Paul when, in distinguishing between Jew and gentile, he regarded everyone who was circumcised as a Jew (Gal. v. 3); and this was also the opinion of Domitian when he ordered that the tax levied on Jews should also be collected from proselytes. The first requirement of Rabbi Trypho, in Justin, *Trypho*, viii., was circumcision; and the necessity of the rite is insisted upon in Talmudic anecdotes. The words of Christ in Matt. xxiii. 15, likewise refer to such circumcised proselytes, who were not originally very numerous. While Hillel made their reception easy, the sterner school of Shammai required a testing of their motives. Only after preparatory instruction imparted by three scribes did the threefold ceremony of reception take place: circumcision, immersion, and sacrifice. The instruction was continued until the immersion, which occurred when the wound was healed. The three teachers were witnesses at the ceremony, and only with this bath of purification was the rite of admission completed. It is, therefore, mentioned more often than circumcision itself, especially by the Hellenistic Jews, who renounced circumcision

but not the immersion that washed away the impurity of heathenism. The relation of this rite to the Christian sacrament of baptism has given rise to much discussion, but the present tendency to derive Christian baptism from the immersion of proselytes is incorrect, especially as the existence of sacramental ideas is not certainly proved in connection either with immersion or circumcision (see Baptism, III., 1, § 1).

6. Status of the Proselyte.

It was in agreement with a legalistic, not with a sacramental, conception that, in the doctrine of the Rabbis, circumcision was looked upon as breaking all earlier ties and changing the very personality of the convert, as was usually typified by the assumption of a new name. A marriage was considered dissolved if the other party was not converted; and by the abrogation of blood-relationship the laws in regard to incest no longer applied. Children born before conversion did not inherit; the community inherited in their place. The harsh isolation of the proselytes was keenly felt by the heathen (Tacitus, *Hist.*, V., 5; Juvenal, *Satiræ*, xiv. 96 sqq.). While all old ties were severed for the proselyte and he was entirely absorbed in the Jewish community, he was not regarded as an equal; he could not say: "our fathers," but "God of the fathers of Israel" or "your fathers." This rule was later abolished, and it was forbidden to remind the proselyte of his origin, since it was shown that the Scriptures spoke of the proselytes in the same way as of Israel. They are alluded to in the thirteenth petition of the daily prayer. Many proselytes seem to have displayed the convert's zeal, and were fanatical toward those of another faith, especially the Christians (Justin, *Trypho*, cxx.). For this reason, many rabbis were particularly fond of the proselytes; others, however, did not favor them, but called them a leprosy, a hindrance to the coming of the Messiah, especially as numerous conversions were due to ulterior motives.

7. Hellenistic Proselytes.

The Hellenistic proselytes should be clearly distinguished from these circumcised proselytes, and they constitute a more important phenomenon, both historically and numerically. Everywhere in the empire groups of the "God-fearing" gathered about the synagogues. They attended the services and assumed some of the obligations, but did not wish to become Jews. This form of proselytism presupposes that weakening of national and legalistic Judaism which obtained in the dispersion, where it appeared as the universal religion of enlightenment, or as a philosophy based on a primeval revelation with sublime ethics and a sure hope of eternal life. Sacrificial rites were abandoned and the prohibitions of meats, etc., were taken in an allegorical sense, only a few being retained in an ascetic and superstitious spirit. This propaganda was served not only by the Greek version of the Old Testament, but also by numerous pseudepigraphic writings such as the Sibylline Books (q.v.) or pseudo-Phocylides. This kind of proselytism must have enjoyed a success not easily over-estimated, and it lasted beyond the time of Hadrian. It admitted, moreover, of innumerable gradations. The most zealous were like Jews, only without circumcision; their children were probably circumcised (Juvenal, *Satiræ*, xiv. 96 sqq.). Many visited the synagogue regularly, others observed only certain customs, such as the lighting of the Sabbath lamp. The Hypsistarii, or "worshipers of the highest God," formed societies of their own after the pattern of the synagogues. These differences show the adaptability of Judaism; at the same time no concessions were made in monotheistic faith or in moral requirements, but solely in liturgical matters. Only the Palestinian rabbis, however, were really consistent; the others allowed themselves to be guided by opportunist considerations. For them the important thing was to gain personal influence, which they won in direct proportion as they required less of their adepts and themselves stood higher above them.

8. Significance for Early Christianity.

While Palestinian proselytism generally made itself felt as a hindrance to the extension of Christianity, and, as a Jewish propaganda in the Gentile communities of Paul, vainly strove to bring the Gospel into subjection to the Law and to circumcision, Hellenistic proselytism, with its widening and weakening of Judaism, did essential preparatory work for the new faith. The "God-fearers," accustomed to monotheistic ideas, morally trained, and familiar with the promises of the Old Testament, offered fertile soil for the propagation of Christianity, which proffered all that was valuable in Judaism, and, in addition, offered fulfilment in place of promise, and inspiring preaching in place of dry doctrine. It had also done away with all that was narrowly Jewish and barbarian, and gave the same rights to the Greeks as to the Jews. The former Jewish proselytes formed the nucleus of the new communities, which soon spread independently among the heathen and left their original Judaism further and further behind. This rivalry in propaganda was the chief reason for the bitter hatred with which early Christianity was pursued by the Jews, and this enmity was, unfortunately, reciprocated by the Christians. In spite of its political privileges, Judaism was overcome and soon abandoned the unequal struggle. Hellenistic Judaism was absorbed by Christianity, and Rabbinical Judaism withdrew within itself, while Christianity evolved a world-embracing missionary activity.

E. von Dobschütz.

Bibliography: For the meaning and use of the word "Proselyte" consult the concordances of Mandelkern, Hatch and Redpath, and Bruder, and the lexicons; W. C. Allen, in *The Expositor*, 1894, cols. 264–272; and E. Nestle, in *ZNTW*, 1904, part 3. Consult: Schürer, *Geschichte*, iii. 102–135, Eng. transl., II., ii. 291–327 (gives a very full list of the earlier literature); Lübkert, in *TSK*, 1835, pp. 681–700; F. Huidekoper, *Judaism at Rome*, New York, 1876; M. M. Kalisch, *Bible Studies*, part 2, London, 1878; A. Weill, *Le Prosélytisme chez les juifs selon la bible et le talmud*, Strasburg, 1880; H. Graetz, *Die jüdischen Proselyten im Römerreiche*, Breslau, 1884; C. Siegfried, *JPT*, 1890, pp. 435–453; C. Fouard, *St. Peter and the First Years of Christianity*, London, 1892 (good chapter on the Jews in Rome and their influence); J. Strauss, in *Expository Times*, iv (1893), 305 sqq.; A. B. Davidson, in *The Expositor*, 1894, pp. 491 sqq.; E. C. A. Riehm, *Handwörterbuch des biblischen Altertums*, ed. F. Baethgen, pp. 1258–61, Bielefeld, 1894; Friedländer, in *REJ*, xxx (1895), 161–181; A. Bertholet, *Die*

Stellung der Israeliten und der Juden zu den Fremden, Freiburg, 1896; E. Meyer, *Entstehung des Judentums*, pp. 227–234, Halle, 1896; M. Friedländer, *Das Judentum in der vorchristlichen jüdischen Welt*, Vienna, 1897; L. Friedländer, *Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms*, iii. 609 sqq., Leipsic, 1901, Eng. transl., *Roman Life and Manners*, London, 1910; W. Bousset, *Religion des Judentums*, pp. 77–86, 2d ed., Berlin, 1906; the tract *Gerim* in the Talmud; Nowack, *Archäologie*, i. 336–341; Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire*, fasc. xxxiii., cols. 758–764; *DB*, iv. 133–137; *EB*, iii. 3901–3906; *JE*, x. 220–224; *DCB*, ii. 444–445.

PROSPER OF AQUITAINE: Champion of the theology of Augustine; b. in Aquitaine probably about 390; d. after 455. Of his life little is known. His full name seems to have been Prosper Tyro, as is stated both by the Brussels manuscript of his chronicle and by Bede (*De arte metrica*, xxii.). He was apparently the author of the *Poema conjugis ad uxorem*, which seems to have been written about 415, and his works show that he received the customary rhetorical education. Theologically he was a disciple of Augustine, though the two never met, and his entire theological activity consisted in the adaptation and defense of Augustinian ideas.

The first relatively certain date in the life of Prosper is that he was in southern Gaul in 428. He seems to have lived in the closest association with the monastic circles of Marseilles, of which his phraseology clearly shows that he regarded himself a member. This was possible even if Prosper's wife were still living, provided he voluntarily subjected himself to continence, as did Paulinus of Nola or Salvianus. Marseilles, however, was the fountain head of the theological tendency later designated as Semi-Pelagianism. Prosper felt it his duty to oppose this movement and accordingly requested the aid of Augustine, who responded with the *De prædestinatione sanctorum* and *De dono perseverantiæ*. During the ensuing period of somewhat profitless controversy Prosper wrote his poem, *De ingratis*, devoted to a refutation of Pelagianism and to an account of Semi-Pelagian doctrines, so presented as to emphasize their relationship to Pelagianism itself. Although of little poetic value, it can not be denied that the *De ingratis* gives a warm and lively expression of its author's convictions.

After Augustine's death, Prosper wrote in defense of his teacher's doctrines on predestination his *Pro Augustino responsiones ad capitula objectionum Gallorum calumniantium*, in which he merely accepts or rejects the deductions drawn from Augustine's writings without attempting to solve the difficulties involved, his formula being, "A thing must not be condemned because it can not be understood." Prosper was now considered the leading representative of Augustinian doctrine, and two Genoese monks, Camillus and Theodorus, appealed to him for an explanation of certain obscurities in Augustine's *De prædestinatione sanctorum* and *De dono perseverantiæ*, his answer being his *Responsiones ad excerpta Genuensium*. About the same time he was forced to defend himself against certain opinions attributed to him, in a captious and prejudiced fashion, by a certain Vincentius who is probably to be identified with Vincent of Lerins (q.v.). This attack Prosper easily met, but despite all his energy he was unable to ensure the victory of Augustine's doctrines in Marseilles. He and Hilarius accordingly went to Rome, at latest by the spring of 432, to secure aid from Celestine I. (see SEMI-PELAGIANISM), and on his return he wrote, in 433 or 434, a reply to the critics of Johannes Cassianus (q.v.) on the teachings of Augustine, his refutation being entitled *De gratia Dei et libero arbitrio*. As a bit of polemics the work is not unskilful, although it does not solve its problem, not only because Prosper failed to recognize the relative justice of his opponent's position, but also because he contented himself with a mere logical demonstration of discrepancies between Pelagianism and Semi-Pelagianism. To this same period belongs the worthless *Epitaphium Nestorianæ et Pelagianæ hæreseon*, occasioned by the condemnation of Nestorius and Celestius at the Synod of Ephesus in 431.

Shortly after his attack on Cassianus Prosper left Gaul for Rome. This fact is clear from a study of his chronicle, the first part of which (to the death of Valens in 378) is excerpted from Eusebius and Jerome, with a few additions from Augustine's *Hær.*; the second part, however, is by Prosper himself. The first section of this latter portion extends to 433, and a third of the notices refers to Gaul, where it was composed. The second and third sections (to 445 and 455 respectively), on the other hand, were written altogether from the standpoint of a Roman, and evidently at Rome.

That Prosper ever remained devoted to Augustine is shown by his book of epigrams, clothing Augustine's ideas in poetic form, and probably written after the Council of Chalcedon. For this collection of 106 poems Prosper had already made preparation in his *Liber sententiarum*, an anthology based partly directly and partly indirectly on Augustine and probably compiled after the condemnation of Nestorius.

A number of writings are incorrectly ascribed to Prosper: the *De vocatione gentium*, composed by a less cumbrous Augustinian than Prosper; the *Carmen de providentia*, written about 417; the *De promissionibus et prædicationibus* of an African adherent of Augustine; and the *De vita contemplativa* of Julianus Pomerius (q.v.). The *Confessio*, on the other hand, assigned to Prosper on manuscript authority was probably written by him. (A. HAUCK.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The first ed. of the *Opera* appeared at Lyons, 1539, and was reprinted several times; new ed. by Le Brun and Mangeant, Paris, 1711, reproduced in *MPL*, li. The "Chronicle," ed. T. Mommsen, is in *MGH, Auct. ant.*, ix (1892), 298 sqq., and in the same, *Chron. min.*, i (1892). Consult: the bibliography on the "Chronicle" in Potthast, *Wegweiser*, p. 942; Gennadius, *De vir. ill.*, lxxxv.; L. Valentin, *S. Prosper d'Aquitaine*, Toulouse, 1900; *DCB*, iv. 492–497; *Histoire littéraire de la France*, ii. 369 sqq.; Tillemont, *Mémoires*, xvi. 1 sqq.; J. C. F. Walch, *Historie der Ketzereien*, v. 57 sqq., Leipsic, 1770; G. Kaufmann, in *Forschungen zur deutschen Geschichte*, xiii (1873), 418–424; A. Ebert, *Geschichte der Litteratur des Mittelalters*, i. 365–368, 440–443, Leipsic, 1889; H. Hertzberg, *Die Historien . . . des Isidorus von Sevilla*, pp. 49–52, Göttingen, 1874; Holder-Egger, in *NA*, i (1876), 15–90, 327–334; Mommsen, in *MGH, Auct. ant.*, ix. 266–271; F. Wörter, *Beiträge zur Dogmengeschichte des Semipelagianismus*, pp. 80 sqq., Paderborn, 1898; O. Bardenhewer, *Patrologie*, p. 450, Freiburg, 1901, Eng. transl., St. Louis, 1908; Wattenbach, *DGQ*, i. 88 sqq., 1904; and the literature under PELAGIUS, PELAGIAN CONTROVERSIES; SEMI-PELAGIANISM.

PROTEVANGELIUM. See APOCRYPHA, B, I., 1.

PROTERIUS. See MONOPHYSITES, § 3.

PROTESTANT EPISCOPALIANS.

I. History.
In Colonial Days (§ 1).
Independent Organization (§ 2).
Growth and Critical Questions (§ 3).
Modern Development (§ 4).
Missionary Work (§ 5).
II. Polity and Organization.
Episcopal Polity (§ 1).
Legislation and Administration (§ 2).
Discipline (§ 3).
Organizations, Educational, Benevolent, and Others (§ 4).
Statistics (§ 5).
Brotherhood of St. Andrew (§ 6).
Cowley Fathers (§ 7).

I. History: The history of this Church, which is the lineal descendant and successor in America of the Church of England, may be said to be coeval with the voyages of Englishmen in this direction.

1. In Colonial Days. Even when, on or about June 24, 1579, Sir Francis Drake made only a temporary landing on the coast of what is now California, his chaplain, the Rev. Francis Fletcher, held regular services out of the Book of Common Prayer, and in a manner claimed the new territory for the Church of England. In the early patents or chapters granted to Sir Humphrey Gilbert, Sir Walter Raleigh, and others who landed on the Atlantic coast, toward the close of the sixteenth century, particular stress was laid upon the obligation to convert the heathen aborigines, and it was stipulated that the Christian faith as taught by the colonists should be in agreement with that of the same church. Records exist of baptisms performed about this time in various places, from the southernmost to the northernmost settlements, even as far as the Kennebec, in Maine, and of other public services held with more or less frequency, all of them antedating by a number of years the arrival of the Mayflower colony at Plymouth (1620). The first church-building of which there is any reliable account was erected at Jamestown, Va., under the auspices of the Rev. Robert Hunt, who had formed part of the colony that landed here in 1607 The same claim of priority is made in behalf of one erected, it is said, in the year 1607 in Maine, by those attending the services of the Rev. Richard Seymour (thought by some to have been the great-grandson of the Duke of Somerset). From this time on, the record of Church life and work is but a meager one until the close of the century, although all along the Atlantic coast there are not a few instances of a growing desire for greater religious privileges, and an equally growing sense of responsibility in the matter of Christianizing the Indians and Negroes. Many individual Churchmen in England, including the archbishops of Canterbury and the bishops of London (to whose jurisdiction the colonies were formally attached), showed more or less interest in this missionary enterprise from time to time; but it was not until the organization in 1701 of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts that the Church began its more aggressive career in America (see Missions, B., II, 4, § 4). It was, however, greatly hampered in its work until nearly the close of the eighteenth century by the utter lack of bishops. The episcopate forming so essential a part of its integrity, the want of it could not be met by any other means, although occasionally some temporary expedients were suggested, especially with reference to the due supply of ministers from among the residents. The only recourse for ordination and confirmation was to the mother-land.

2. Independent Organization. For various reasons, partly political and partly ecclesiastical, and not altogether appertaining to England, the consecration of bishops for America was delayed year after year, until in the year 1784, at Aberdeen, the Rev. Samuel Seabury was consecrated bishop of Connecticut by the canonical number of prelates, all of them Scottish non-jurors. In 1787 the Rev. William White was consecrated bishop of Pennsylvania, and the Rev. Samuel Provoost bishop of New York; both in Lambeth Palace by the archbishops of Canterbury and York, assisted by the bishop of Bath and Wells and the bishop of Peterborough. In 1790 the Rev. James Madison was consecrated in the same place bishop of Virginia, and in 1792 at the General Convention, held in New York, the Rev. Thomas John Claggett was consecrated bishop of Maryland by Bishops Seabury, White, Provoost, and Madison. By this fusion of the two equally valid sources of orders, all doubts were set at rest, and the controversy as to the validity of Bishop Seabury's consecration was practically ended. In the mean time, the Church was busily engaged, through its diocesan and general conventions, in completing its independent national organization. The Prayer Book, finally ratified in the year 1789, was substantially the same as that of the Church of England, from which the chief departures were the omission of the Athanasian Creed and the substitution of essential features of the Scotch communion office. This latter change was made largely through the efforts of Bishop Seabury, who had promised his influence to this effect before his consecration. Among the missionaries belonging to this period, were John and Charles Wesley and George Whitefield, all of whom died, as they had lived, in the communion of the Church of England. The character of the church in not a few important particulars in these early days was due to Bishop Seabury and Bishop White, both of whom, while differing in many respects, were men of ability and influence, and of unswerving loyalty to their principles. In the formative stage of independent existence, the intensity of the former and the conservatism of the latter were happily combined to avoid serious errors. In connection with the political troubles arising toward the close of the eighteenth century, the Church was confronted with grave perils and difficulties. Among the clergy, there was the strong feeling of indebtedness on every score to their fatherland which made them hesitate, naturally enough, to side with those who were ready for revolution, prepared as many of them were to recognize the injustice shown the colonies. And among the laity, this loyalty to the

oaths which the clergy had assumed led to suspicion and a straining of the relations between them. In maintaining conscientiously their allegiance to their English authorities, the clergy endured in many instances not only mental anguish but severe bodily persecution and suffering. Yet notwithstanding this position of some, it is to be remembered that the Declaration of Rights in which the evils endured by the colonists were forcibly set forth was written by George Mason, a member of the Church in Virginia, and that not less than two-thirds of the signers of the Declaration of Independence as well as its author, Thomas Jefferson, were likewise members of the Church. And when the national independence was finally achieved, it was from this same Church that a large proportion was drawn of the men who were chiefly responsible for the adoption of the Constitution and the filling of the important posts in the administration of public offices. This is evident when such names are mentioned as George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, John Marshall, John Jay, Alexander Hamilton, Robert Morris, Francis Hopkinson, John Randolph, Patrick Henry, and the Pinkneys.

3. Growth and Critical Questions.

The disquietude of these days and the suspicion of Toryism hid lurking in the minds of many, joined to the paucity of clergy, made the growth of the Church difficult for years. It was not until the more general appreciation of its really missionary character, say, about 1830, that progress became wider and more evident. From that time on, this progress has continued uninterruptedly until of late its growth has increased in more rapid proportion than that of any other religious body, gaining even upon the ratio of growth in the general population of the country. It has passed safely through several crises succeeding that of the period of the war for independence. One of these was contemporaneous with the Oxford Movement in the Church of England, about the middle of the nineteenth century (see TRACTARIANISM). Under the excitement engendered by the ecclesiastical controversies involved in this movement, the parties which had for some time existed under the names of High Church and Low Church became more pronounced in their differences, and not a little acerbity of feeling was manifested. This spirit of partizanship continued to assert itself more or less for a generation, even in regard to things of a ceremonial character which, in the light of the harmony and good-will now existing, seem trivial if not utterly insignificant. Another and a momentous crisis arose out of the Civil War. Among the prominent men who participated in the scenes preceding and following this sad epoch, were many, both North and South, who were equally prominent in the church. Satisfied of their ultimate success in establishing the Confederacy, the southern dioceses set up an independent organization, and broke off all formal communication with their brethren in the North. These, however, with a charity most admirable, ignored the fact of any separation; at the General Convention held at New York, in the year 1862, the names of the seceding dioceses were regularly called and seats assigned them as before. Nor did these dioceses allow that any separation had taken place except upon purely political questions, declaring by the hands of their Committee on the state of the church that "though now found within different political boundaries, the Church remains substantially one." When the General Convention met at Philadelphia in 1865, two Southern bishops (Thomas Atkinson and Henry Champlin Lay) were present and some deputies from three Southern dioceses, one of them, the Rev. Charles Todd Quintard, being consecrated bishop of Tennessee during the session. Some anxiety as to a complete reunion was felt on account of incidents that had occurred during the war. One was the taking of arms by the Right Rev. Leonidas Polk, Bishop of Louisiana, who became a major-general in the Confederate army. His death in battle removed the first difficulty. The other was the consecration of the Rev. Richard Hooker Wilmer as bishop of Alabama without the consent of the whole Church, as required by the canons in force before the war. This matter, however, was satisfactorily adjusted, and the Church presented to a still distracted nation the first spectacle of complete reunion, the influence of which was potent in hastening the settlement of all remaining disputes, ecclesiastical, political, and social. The only case of schism with which the church had had to deal was that of the formation, chiefly by its own ministers, of what is known as the Reformed Episcopal Church (see REFORMED EPISCOPALIANS). These, with a small following of laymen, persuaded that there were in the Prayer-book what they called "Romanizing germs," in Dec., 1873, formed the organization named, under the leadership of the Right Rev. George David Cummins (q.v.), assistant bishop of Kentucky, and the Rev. Charles Edward Cheney (q.v.), of Chicago. Both of these were deposed, after they had been treated with great leniency in the hope that they would abandon their separatist attitude.

4. Modern Development.

In 1880, a joint committee of the two houses constituting the General Convention was appointed to consider whether "the changed conditions of the national life do not demand certain alterations in the Book of Common Prayer, in the direction of liturgical enrichment and increased flexibility of use." The study of this important subject occupied the attention of the church for twelve years, so that it was not until 1892 that the revised prayer-book was authorized for use. No radical change was proposed; no alteration was made in the standards of doctrine, and the prevailing principles of liturgical construction and ritual were studiously maintained. What was accomplished was the correction of the few typographical errors; the elucidation of rubrical obscurities or inaccuracies; the restoration of some canticles and versicles omitted originally from the English book, special prayers for Unity, Missions, Rogation-days, etc., an altar service for the Feast of the Transfiguration, second offices for Christmas-Day and Easter Day, proper psalms for special occasions; the revision of the lectionary; the printing of the psalms and canticles with the musical colon, and of the Articles of Religion at the end of the volume, with

a title-page of their own. The discussion of the matter was almost wholly without partizan controversy, and it was felt by all that a distinct value had been added to a book already greatly venerated. The revision of the hymnal occupied even a longer period, beginning in 1859 and not concluding finally until 1895. During this time, the old division into Metrical Psalms and Hymns proper was abolished, and many omissions, additions, and changes were made. As to the matter of choirs, there has been quite a change during the past hundred years. In the earlier part of this period, they consisted only of men and women, largely of skilled quartettes, although there were not wanting instances, now and then, of surpliced choirs of men and boys. During the latter half of this period these surpliced choirs have multiplied greatly, and in many parishes there are now vested choirs of men and women. Quartettes are but seldom found. The old organ gallery has likewise almost disappeared, the organs and choirs being now almost altogether in or near the chancel, or choir proper. One subject that has greatly and constantly occupied the mind of this Church has been that of the restoration of Christian unity, a subject which, in view of the heterogeneous character of the American population and of the dangerous elements found in some parts of it, is one of vast and practical importance. Earnest heed was paid to it in the early days of the Church's independent organization, and at different periods of its subsequent history overtures upon the subject have been addressed to the General Convention. A standing commission dealing with it has been in existence for a number of years. At the General Convention held at Chicago in 1886, a committee of the House of Bishops reported a platform upon which it was hoped all Christians could eventually stand, and this, with alterations and additions which were significant and, in the case of the introductory statement, of considerable importance, was subsequently adopted and promulgated by the Lambeth Conference of 1888, consisting of the great majority of all bishops of the Anglican Communion. For the exact wording of this platform see FUNDAMENTAL DOCTRINES OF CHRISTANITY, § 4; see also LAMBETH ARTICLES; LAMBETH CONFERENCE. This statement, popularly known as the quadrilateral, remains to-day the only formulated proposition for unity put forth by any one of the many religious organizations of the land.

5. Missionary Work.

The work of the Church coming technically under this heading, began at the very outset of its history, even in colonial days, among the Indians and negroes. These have ever since occupied attention in continuous efforts to evangelize them and to afford them every religious privilege belonging to others. From their ranks have come a large number of clergymen who have been ordained to serve especially among their fellows. Before the Civil War multitudes of negroes in the South were numbered among the communicants of the Episcopal Church, and since that period the southern dioceses have been most diligent in seeking their spiritual welfare, with no small measure of success. The heterogeneous character of the country's population has led the Church to organize special missions for the benefit of its different elements, e.g., among the Italians, the Germans, the French, the Swedes, the Spanish, and the Jews, with the prayer-book in their several languages, and clergymen of their own races. Special work is also undertaken among the blind and the deaf, the inmates of various institutions, both benevolent and penal, as also among soldiers and sailors, etc. As to work in foreign and heathen lands, the Church early in the nineteenth century began to show her interest and sense of responsibility. In 1821, the Rev. Joseph R. Andrews (or Andrus) went to Africa, where he died shortly after beginning his labors. Others followed him at intervals, and subsequently a bishop was consecrated for work there. In 1829 a mission was inaugurated in Greece, which in its educational department is still in operation in the school at Athens, founded by the Rev. John Henry Hill and his wife. In 1835 missionaries went to China, and in 1859 to Japan. In both of these countries, the church has now several bishops with a number of other clergymen and lay-workers, both foreign and native. In Haiti, since 1875, Right Rev. James Theodore Holly, a colored man, has been in charge of church work there. In Mexico, since 1879, this church has been more or less in charge of native and reformed congregations that desired to be in communion with it, and that country is recognized as a part of its missionary field. In 1899 Rev. Lucien Lee Kinsolving was consecrated bishop of southern Brazil, and he has gathered around him an increasing number of clergymen and congregations. A similar provision for Cuba was made in the year 1904, although work had been carried on there for more than forty years. Bishops have also been consecrated of late for Honolulu, for the Philippine Islands, and Porto Rico, and already very promising results have followed upon their appointment.

II. Polity and Organization: In the preface to the Ordinal, it is stated that " it is evident unto all men diligently reading Holy Scriptures and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church— Bishops, Priests, and Deacons." Accordingly, this church is constituted, as to its ministry, after this primitive manner, and since 1859 it has been the custom to place every part of the recognized territory of the United States under the jurisdiction of some bishop. This rule equally attains as to those countries which are in any formal manner under its protection. Neither does it maintain any mission in any foreign land without a similar provision. Its territorial divisions are known as either dioceses or missionary districts, the former being such as are autonomous, or independent of outside aid, having authority to elect their own bishops; the latter such as are dependent for their support mainly upon the church at large and receive their bishops from the same source. Dioceses may comprise the whole or a part of the states in which they are organized. Missionary districts may form the whole or a part of any state or territory, whether within or without the United States. Thus it may

1. Episcopal Polity.

happen that even within a former independent diocese, there may be formed a new missionary district. Some steps have been taken toward the creation of provinces. A missionary bishop is eligible, subject to confirmation by the rest of the church, to a diocesan episcopate; but it has always been maintained—although there is no constitutional nor canonical provision to this effect—that no diocesan bishop should be translated from his original jurisdiction to another. Bishops-coadjutor are allowed, with the right of succession. In the general convention of 1910 provision was made for the election of suffragan bishops. Under this provision a suffragan bishop has not the right of succession, but remains eligible to election as bishop or bishop-coadjutor. At that convention there was elected a suffragan bishop of New York. The detached churches in foreign lands, as e.g., in Paris, Rome, Dresden, etc., are under the supervision of an American bishop appointed by the presiding bishop.

2. Legislation and Administration.

The legislation for and the administration of ecclesiastical affairs are lodged, first in the General Convention, next in diocesan conventions, and lastly in parochial vestries or mission-committees meeting occasionally. The General Convention consists of two houses: the house of bishops, comprising all bishops of the American communion; and the house of clerical and lay deputies, comprising four of each order from each diocese duly chosen by its diocesan convention. In the latter house, representatives from missionary districts and from the convocation of foreign churches are privileged to sit and speak, without the right to vote. In the General Convention, it is necessary to have a concurrent vote before any measure can become operative. The senior bishop according to date of consecration is styled the presiding bishop, to whom is delegated during the intervals between the General Conventions the administration of important and necessary affairs of a general character. An assessor to the presiding bishop, who also acts as chairman of the house of bishops during its sessions, is chosen triennially by the members of that house. No bishop elected by a diocesan convention can be consecrated unless confirmed by a majority of all the standing committees—bodies chosen annually by the various diocesan conventions as councils of advice to the bishops, and consisting, except in three or four instances, of both clergymen and laymen—and of all the bishops, except when such elections have occurred within six months of the meeting of the General Convention. In this case, the matter is settled by a concurrent vote of both houses. Rectors are chosen by the vestries of the several parishes, usually after conference with the bishop of the diocese. Missionaries are appointed by the bishop, with or without the concurrence of a diocesan committee. The vestries are chosen annually by the members of the various congregations, under the provisions of local enactment. Delegates to the diocesan conventions are elected by the parochial vestries. In some dioceses, it is requisite that both vestrymen and delegates shall be communicants in good standing; in some it is not. Only such communicants are eligible as lay deputies to the General Convention. No one can be ordained to the ministry who has not been for the appointed time first a postulant and then a candidate, nor until, after sundry examinations, he has been recommended to the bishop by the standing committee of the diocese to which he belongs. It is further required that he should present certain testimonials as to character and fitness from a certain number of clergymen and laymen. He can not be admitted a candidate until he is at least twenty-one years old, nor ordained a priest until he is at least twenty-four years old. A bishop must be at least thirty years of age. Provision is made for the appointment of deaconesses (see DEACONESS, III., 2., d, § 2), who must be at least twenty-three years of age, and be properly qualified, and recommended by clergymen and laymen. There is no cognizance of sisterhoods in the general canons, it having been deemed best to leave everything relating to them in the hands of the several bishops. Lay-readers form the subject of canonical provision, and are under the immediate supervision of the bishops and of such rectors as ask for their appointment. No church-building can be consecrated until the bishop has ample assurance that there is no pecuniary debt upon it or upon the ground where it may be erected. The music of a church is under the direction of the rector. For over fifty years, the subject of cathedrals has been before the church as a practical matter. Bishop William Ingraham Kip of California was perhaps the first prelate to give it expression in 1855, a time when there was no little prejudice, even opposition, to encounter. In 1861 Henry John Whitehouse, bishop of Illinois, put it into more formal shape. To-day, there are about forty dioceses where cathedral organizations exist. In some, however, they are scarcely more than nominal establishments, and the cathedrals themselves little else than parish churches. But the idea is being gradually developed and utilized, while in the almost completed cathedral at Albany, and in the growing one at New York, the structures well deserve the name in every respect. At Washington there is also the nucleus of one worthy of the Church and the nation.

3. Discipline.

In the matter of discipline, there are canonical provisions both general and diocesan. The duties of clergymen and laymen alike are in many instances plainly set forth, and violations of the law, both as to doctrine and manner of life, are the subject of well-matured enactments. In the General Convention of 1904, provision was made for courts of review for the trial of bishops and other clergymen. The principal subject under this heading that has occupied the attention of the church has been that of Marriage and Divorce (qq.v.). It has been felt for years that the low and injurious views upon this subject demanded stricter legislation, and the main purpose of those concerned in this has been to make it unlawful for any person divorced on any ground, even that of adultery, to marry again during the lifetime of either husband or wife. A canon to this effect was passed by a large majority of the house of bishops at the General Convention of 1904, but lost by a small majority

in the other house. The matter was brought before the General Convention in 1910, and discussion was deferred till 1913. While the English table of affinity has not been formally adopted, there are many clergymen who will not marry persons within its prohibitory lines.

4. Organizations, Educational, Benevolent, and Others.

In early colonial days, this Church felt the need of educational institutions that should be under its auspices and direction. As early as 1691 a charter was obtained for William and Mary College in Virginia, in which provision was made for the education of suitable men for the ministry, and also for the due propagation of Christianity. The first buildings were designed by Sir Christopher Wren. A number of parish-schools were also established. King's College (now Columbia University) was subsequently founded, the president of which must always be a member of this church, and the prayers used in public worship must always be taken from the Book of Common Prayer. Among the other colleges more or less directly related to the church are Trinity College, Hartford (which succeeded to Washington College, chartered in 1823), Kenyon College, Hobart College, the University of the South, St. Stephen's College, Annandale, and Lehigh University. In connection with a number of the leading denominational colleges, church-halls have been erected, and other means are in use to keep in touch with undergraduates belonging to the church. The number of parochial schools always has been small. As to boarding-schools, there are not a few scattered in as many as thirty different dioceses, the oldest for girls, St. Mary's Hall, Burlington, N. J., founded in the year 1837 The pioneer successful school for boys is St. Paul's School, near Concord, N. H., founded in 1856 by George Cheyne Shattuck, M.D., of which the Rev. Henry Augustus Coit was the famous head-master for nearly forty years. Of theological seminaries there are no less than sixteen, in various parts of the country. Of them, the oldest (1817) and by far the largest and most important is the General Theological Seminary, in New York, with superb buildings and a liberal endowment. Each has its own excellencies, and all are supplied with able faculties, and number among their graduates many of the most eminent of the clergy. In all but one, the tuition is free; and in most of them the charge for the use of rooms is either nothing or merely nominal. There are also several training-schools for deaconesses, as in New York and Philadelphia, where thorough instruction, both theoretical and practical, is given to those who may wish to devote themselves to church work at home or abroad. Among the many other organizations of this church are the Brotherhood of St. Andrew (1883) and the Daughters of the King (1885). These are identical in their plans and operations, one for men, and the other for women; the common object being to interest more directly the younger people in the affairs and life of the church. The members are bound alike by the two rules of prayer and service. Junior departments have in view the training of girls and boys for more active membership when they shall have become adults. The Girls' Friendly Society has a large membership, and is intended to afford, under the guidance and fellowship of lady-associates, opportunities for healthy recreation and safe social enjoyment to girls and young women who are engaged in business or in domestic service. The number of hospitals, day-nurseries, orphan asylums, homes for cripples, consumptives, and aged and infirm people, houses of mercy for the fallen and incorrigible, and for other needy and afflicted persons, is constantly increasing and their capacity for usefulness constantly enlarging, as liberal donations and endowments are being made from time to time. In this practical application of Christianity, almost every diocese and missionary jurisdiction shares. Many of these institutions are either exclusively or partly under the care of sisterhoods, of which there are now working under the auspices of this church something like twenty—some of them being branches of English communities, others founded in America. Beside these, there are several communities of deaconesses. Among the clergy, there are also several religious orders, the chief of which are the Society of St. John the Evangelist, with its American headquarters at Boston, and the Order of the Holy Cross with its new and spacious monastic buildings at West Park, N. Y. Their chief work is that of preaching, holding missions, retreats, etc., although the first-named order is also engaged in parochial work. For social purposes chiefly, but not exclusively, there have been organized of late years what are known as church-clubs, with large numbers of members, confined mainly to the laity. These exist now in over thirty dioceses. There is annually a congress of delegates from these various associations. In addition to all these organizations, there are many others throughout the country, whose main object is the more direct and local dealing with and forwarding the church's work in different directions, such as missions, Sunday-schools, temperance reform, social reform, Christian unity, etc., so that ample opportunity is afforded all the members of the church to engage in some branch of religious and philanthropic industry. The support of the parochial, diocesan, missionary, educational, and benevolent work of the church is mainly derived from the voluntary offerings of its members. For some purposes there are assessments, laid mostly by diocesan authorities. Pew rents still obtain in some of the older and larger parishes, but over eighty per cent of the total number are now conducted upon what is known as the free church system, no seats being rented or formally appropriated. This system has grown marvelously in the past sixty years.

5. Statistics.

At the end of the year 1910, there were in the United States and dependencies 67 dioceses and 26 missionary districts; in foreign lands there were 11 missionary districts or dioceses. Of clergymen, there were in 1909 103 bishops and 5,516 priests and deacons, in all 5,619. There were 8,017 parishes and mission-stations; 50,153 Sunday-school teachers and 455,495 pupils. The total number of communicants, including the missionary districts, was 929,117, which would give a total membership

of over four millions. The whole amount of various contributions reported for the year 1909 was $18,358,821.28. LEIGHTON COLEMAN†.

6. Brotherhood of St. Andrew.

The Brotherhood of St. Andrew is an organization of laymen operating in the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, in the Church of England, and in their branches wherever found. Its object is "the spread of Christ's kingdom among men, especially young men." It is composed of men and boys of all ages and conditions, who recognize that as baptized churchmen they are pledged to do the will of God, in trying to help other men to know our Lord through his Church. The brotherhood began as a parochial gild in St. James' Church, Chicago, on St. Andrew's Day, 1883, when twelve young men, with the approval of their rector, W. H. Vibbert, and under the leadership of Mr. James L. Houghteling, who is the founder of the brotherhood, agreed to follow the example set by St. Andrew in bringing St. Peter into a personal acquaintance with the Messiah, as recorded in John i. 40–42. They adopted two rules: (1) "To pray daily for the spread of Christ's kingdom among young men"; (2) "To make an earnest effort each week to bring at least one young man within the hearing of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, as set forth in the services of the Church and in young men's Bible classes." Their efforts were successful beyond expectation, and similar gilds were formed in several dioceses. In 1886 thirty-five of these gilds united in a general organization known as the Brotherhood of St. Andrew in the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States. There are now in this country about 1,000 active senior branches, or chapters, with a total membership of about 12,000, and 500 junior chapters with a total membership of about 6,000. The junior department consists of small bands of Christian boys who are trained not only to live straight but to help other boys to live straight. They join entirely for what they can give and not for what they can get, and there are no amusements or attractions of any kind. The minimum age for membership is twelve, but most of the boys average sixteen and are usually boys who have been confirmed. The object of this department is the spread of Christ's kingdom among boys. In addition to this it acts as a training ground for membership in the senior order. It is the only society of the kind in the world, abandoning as it does almost all the usual methods by which boys are reached and influenced, everything except definite and real religious work for other boys being barred out. While the membership of the brotherhood consists entirely of laymen, the brotherhood works only by the approval of the clergy, no chapter being allowed to exist without the written consent of the rector or minister in charge. The chapters are independent in all particular and local affairs, but are dependent upon and responsible to one another as regards the interests and obligations common to all. Any baptized man is eligible for membership, but membership can be had only through a local chapter.

A convention is held each year, at which every chapter in good standing is entitled to be represented. The convention appoints a national council which is charged with the executive direction of the brotherhood. This council maintains an office in the Broad Exchange Building, Boston, Mass., as headquarters for the brotherhood, through which the different chapters are brought into communication with one another. It publishes the international brotherhood monthly magazine, *St. Andrew's Cross*, and other literature about brotherhood work and methods. HUBERT CARLETON.

7. Cowley Fathers.

The Society of Mission Priests of St. John the Evangelist (sometimes called the Evangelist Fathers or the Cowley Fathers) is a religious community of clergymen in the Anglican Communion founded at Cowley, a southern suburb of Oxford, England, in 1865. The first members were Richard Meux Benson (vicar of Cowley, the parish within which the community was organized), Simeon Wilberforce O'Neill, and Charles Chapman Grafton, an American clergyman (who afterward became bishop of Fond du Lac in Wisconsin). The institution is worthy of commendation as being the first successful attempt since the Reformation to organize a religious community of men in the Church of England. The dedicated life of women in sisterhoods had been revived some years earlier. Other brotherhoods have been formed since. From the first the community at Cowley had the informal sanction of the bishop of Oxford (Samuel Wilberforce), to whom as clergymen its members were necessarily responsible for ministerial licenses. Bishop Wilberforce's successor continued the same friendly relations with the community, and when the statutes and rule were formally established, he gave them his official sanction and became visitor of the society. It is the declared purpose of the society that its members should be subject in all canonical matters to the bishop of the diocese in which they may be resident or working, while for personal and community purposes they are as free as other clergymen to adopt obligations not inconsistent with their ministerial duties. The object of the society is thus stated in its statutes: "The Society of the Mission Priests of St. John the Evangelist has been formed for the cultivation of a life dedicated to God according to the principles of Poverty, Chastity, and Obedience, and will occupy itself in works both missionary and educational, both at home and abroad, for the advancement of the kingdom of Christ, as God in His good Providence may seem to call."

Lay brothers are associated with the priests in dedication to the religious life, but they have no share in the government of the society. No one is allowed to take the life vows until he is thirty years of age, nor until he has passed through a lengthened term of probation. The superior general is elected every three years at a greater chapter of the society. All other officers are appointed by him, including the superiors of provinces, as in America, India, and South Africa.

The society has branch houses in Boston, U. S. A., Bombay and Poona, Capetown and Kaffraria. Beside their direct missionary work, the external occupation of the Fathers is largely in conducting re-

treats (seasons of devotional retirement) for men or women, clergymen or lay people, in preaching missions, where they are invited thus to aid the parish clergy, and in guiding religious communities of women. Clergymen and laymen are received as visitors, for the purpose of testing their vocation, and for devotion or study, at the different houses of the society, and much devotional and doctrinal literature has been published by its members, who now number about forty. ARTHUR C. A. HALL.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: S. D. McConnell, *Hist. of the American Episcopal Church*, New York, 7th ed., 1897; S. Wilberforce, *History of the American Church*, ib. 1849; J. S. M. Anderson, *Hist. of the Church in the Colonies*, 3 vols., London, 1856; W. S. Perry, *Historical Collections Relating to the American Colonial Church*, 5 vols., Hartford, 1870–78; idem, *Handbook of the General Convention of the P. E. Church, Giving its Hist. and Constitution, 1875–80*, New York, 1881; idem, *Hist. of the American Episcopal Church, 1587–1883*, 2 vols., Boston, 1885; idem, *The Episcopate in America*, New York, 1895; H. G. Patterson, *The American Episcopate*, Philadelphia, 1878; W. White, *Memoirs of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, New York, 1881; R. E. Beardsley, *Hist. of the Church in Connecticut*, 2 vols., Boston, 1883; W. Benham, *Short Hist. of the American Church*, New York, 1884; J. G. Wilson and Others, *Centennial Hist. of the P. E. Church in the Diocese of New York, 1785–1885*, ib. 1886; L. Coleman, *Hist. of the Church in America*, ib. 1895; C. C. Tiffany, *Hist. of the P. E. Church in the U. S.*, ib. 1895; M. Dix, *Hist. of the Parish of Trinity Church in . . New York*, 4 vols., ib. 1898–1907; A. L. Cross, *The Anglican Episcopate and the American Colonics*, ib. 1902; Lucy C. Jarvis, *Sketches of Church Life in Colonial Connecticut*, New Haven, 1902; G. W. Peterkin, *Hist. and Record of the P. E. Church in . . W. Virginia*, Charleston, W. Va., 1902; D. D. Addison, *The Episcopalians*, New York, 1904; G. Hodges, *300 Years of the Episcopal Church in America*, Philadelphia, 1907; W. Updike, *Hist. of the Episcopal Church in Narragansett, R. I.*, 3 vols., Boston, 1907; A. B. Richmond, *American Episcopal Church in China*, Baltimore, 1908; *Papers and Speeches of the Church Congress in Boston, May, 1909*, New York, 1909; M. D. Haywood, *Lives of the Bishops of North Carolina*, Raleigh, N. C., 1910.

On doctrine, law, and polity consult: A. A. Benton, *The Church Cyclopœdia*, Philadelphia, 1884; J. A. Andrews, *Church Law*, Columbus, O., 1885; W. F. Hook, *Church Dictionary*, London, 1887; G. Hodges, *The Episcopal Church; its Doctrines, Ministry, Worship and Sacraments*, New York, 1892; G. H. Humphrey, *Law of the P. E. Church*, ib. 1895; W. J. Miller, *American Church Dictionary*, ib. 1902; F. W. Westcott, *Catholic Principles as Illustrated in the Doctrine, Hist. and Organization of the American Catholic Church in the U. S.*, Milwaukee, 1902.

PROTESTANT FRIENDS. See FREE CONGREGATIONS.

PROTESTANT METHODISTS. See METHODISTS, I., 5.

PROTESTANT UNION (GERMAN): An association of German Protestants for the revival of Protestantism in the spirit of Evangelical freedom and in harmony with the demands of modern civilization. The statutes of the society set forth its aims as follows: the development of German Protestant churches upon a congregational basis according to the special conditions governing the various countries containing a German population, as well as preparations for a combination of the national Churches; resistance to all hierarchic and un-Protestant tendencies within the different churches, and the preservation of the rights, the honor, and the liberty of German Protestantism; the maintenance and furtherance of Christian respect between the various denominations and their members; and the stimulation and furtherance of Christian life, as well as of all Christian undertakings that concern the morality and welfare of the people. The establishment of the association, in 1863, was due primarily to the alienation of both masses and whole classes from the Church, although in the majority of cases this was in no sense a denial of Christianity, still less of all religious faith. The chief reason for this estrangement was to be sought in the failure of the Church to adapt itself to modern culture; the efforts made in this direction in the early part of the nineteenth century were abandoned in the twenties, because it seemed as though the historic foundations of belief were being endangered, and a religious reaction set in which was afterward strengthened by political reaction. It was, however, held to be absolutely essential that the Church should be a friendly ally of modern civilization, on condition that this civilization should submit to the educational influence of the spirit of Christ. There must be unrestrained historical criticism of the sources of revelation; the Church must cease to be an organization of theologians and must concede all possible freedom to the work of laymen. On the other hand, those estranged from the Church must overcome their indifference and clearly recognize the real power of religion, of Christianity, and of the Church; they must understand that morality is based on Christianity.

Aims and Origin.

To arouse the Church to the necessity for this reform was the task proposed by the Protestant Union. Various conflicts in the matter of church government and administration, as well as in reference to theological teaching, preceded the foundation of the Union and helped to explain its existence. In 1862 Daniel Schenkel (q.v.) issued a call to all liberal Christians to form a German Protestant party, and at the Durlach conference of Aug. 3, 1863, he urged still more earnestly the institution of a German Protestant congress to prepare the way for a general representation of all the German Churches, such as could not be offered by the Eisenach Conference (q.v.) or by the Church Congress. The Durlach conference unanimously accepted this proposition and invited a number of the most prominent men of the various German Churches to a meeting which was held Sept. 30, 1863, at Frankfort. Here the Protestant Union was founded. Any reputable person belonging to a Protestant church may become a member. It was originally provided that a congress should assemble each year, or as often as might be necessary; but since political events interfered several times, it was determined in 1883 that the general assemblies should be held biennially. Later, in 1901, it was decided that they should meet at least every three years. In 1904 the union had twenty branches with about 25,000 members, of whom 20,000 belonged to the Protestant Union of the Bavarian Palatinate. Headquarters are now in Berlin.

The activity of the Protestant Union has consisted principally in the stand taken in regard to certain ecclesiastical questions and in the reaffirmation and defense of the principles of the society; and

its entire course has been marked by opposition to the Roman Catholic Church. In 1896 a petition was presented to the Reichstag opposing the abrogation of the law regarding the Jesuits; in 1886, at Wiesbaden an attack was made on contemporary efforts to separate the Church completely from State control, and it was held that the sanctioning of ecclesiastical laws should still remain the prerogative of the State. The right of the State to have the chief direction of the schools was also emphasized in 1869, and obligatory civil marriage was demanded in 1865, any confirmation of such marriage by the Church being condemned by the union as illegal in 1875. The principle of the union of all the Protestant Churches has always been maintained, the final aim being the organization of a German national Church which shall in no way exclude the preservation of the individuality of the provincial churches.

Activity and Results.

The sole periodical expressly designated as published under the auspices of the Protestant Union is the monthly *Protestantische Flugblätter*, founded 1866 at Elberfeld, now appearing at Schöneberg-Berlin. A *Jahrbuch* was issued for four years (Elberfeld, 1869–72); and the society also published the New Testament portion of a *Protestantenbibel* (ed. P W Schmidt and F von Holtzendorf, Leipsic, 1872), while the Palatine branch sent forth an *Andachtsbuch* (Neustadt, 1870). A number of minor periodicals are also maintained. Other agencies for the propagation of the interests of the association, such as traveling lecturers, have also been employed; and in 1899 a fund was established for clergy deposed for heterodoxy.

The Protestant Union has been violently assailed both by individual pastors and by conferences of clergymen. The Prussian Supreme Church Council declared against it in 1865 and again in 1871, and clergymen who represented its principles were excluded from church offices, dismissed, or threatened with dismissal; and the members of the union were excluded from the district synods of Hanover. At the same time, though many of the members of the union have been destructive in tendency, the constructive spirit has often been manifested, as in the refusal, in 1882, to sanction the establishment of a "People's Church," and in the protests against the religious indifference and hostility of German liberalism. The union has at least partially aided in the introduction of synodal and presbyterial organization in several of the national churches of the German states and in securing equal rights for Lutherans and Reformed, and has succeeded in reviving religious interest and trust in many formerly estranged both from faith and from the Church.

(Paul Mehlhorn.)

Bibliography: Sources are *Der allgemeine deutsche Protestantenverein in seinen Statuten, . Ansprachen, Thesen und Resolutionen seiner Hauptversammlungen*, Berlin, 1889; and the *Verhandlungen* of the "Protestantentage" issued separately either at Elberfeld, Berlin, or Leipsic. Consult further: D. Schenkel, *Der deutsche Protestantenverein und seine Bedeutung*, 2d ed.. Wiesbaden, 1871; D. Schmidt, *Der Protestantenverein in zehn Briefen für und wider*, Gütersloh, 1873 (adverse); J. E. Wehsky, *Das positive Christentum des Protestantenvereins*, Berlin, 1882; W. Hönig, *Die Arbeit des deutschen Protestantenvereins*, ib. 1888; idem, *Der deutsche Protestantenverein*, Bremen, 1904.

PROTESTANTISM.

I. Name.
II. External Development and Present Status.
Territorial Conquests (§ 1).
Concept of Toleration (§ 2).
Later Protestantism (§ 3).
Numbers and Distribution (§ 4).
III. The Fundamental Principles of Protestantism as Conceived by Luther.
Norms of Faith (§ 1).
Private Judgment (§ 2).
Justification by Faith (§ 3).
New Ethical and Legal Standards (§ 4).
Church and Sacraments (§ 5).
IV. The Lutheran Church.
Luther and Melanchthon (§ 1).
The Church a School (§ 2).
Melanchthon's System (§ 3).
Lutheranism and Scholarship (§ 4).
Church and State (§ 5).
Lutheran Orthodoxy (§ 6).
V. The Reformed Church.
Character and Foundation (§ 1).
Theory and Use of the Bible (§ 2).
Legalism and Otherworldliness (§ 3).
Theocracy and Church Freedom (§ 4).
Lord's Supper and Liturgy (§ 5).
VI. Internal Development of Protestantism since the Enlightenment.
Pietism and the Enlightenment (§ 1).
The Passing of Orthodoxy (§ 2).
Kant and Schleiermacher (§ 3).
The Nineteenth Century (§ 4).
Relation to the State (§ 5).
VII. The Church of England.

In history Protestantism involves a far wider group of phenomena than the larger or smaller ecclesiastical organizations sprung from the Reformation (q.v.). At the same time, it must primarily be considered as an ecclesiastical, or at least as a religious, movement; and it can maintain its existence only as a concept and presentation of Christianity, even though the Reformation was closely connected with the general conditions of the age, the Renaissance, and the political and social conditions of Europe, especially of Germany. Protestantism took its rise in the wish to regenerate Roman Catholicism on the pattern of the primitive Church, or, as its protagonists said, "according to the Gospel." In the present article the cultural elements connected with Protestantism must be excluded; only an outline of the system as a phenomenon of Christianity can here be attempted. Its development, however, has been far from uniform; various types of religious bodies have represented it in history, and still constitute highly significant forms of its existence. Even as thus limited, the subject is one of peculiar difficulty, and almost every point which must be touched upon is still a matter of controversy.

I. Name: The name "Protestant" originated from the "protestation" in which the leading German princes friendly to the Reformation united with fourteen cities of Germany on Apr. 25, 1529, against the decree of the Roman majority of the second Diet of Speyer (see Speyer, Diets of). It was a designation quite colorless from the religious point of view, and was first used as a political epithet by the opponents of those who signed the

protest. It was not necessarily applied in an opprobrious sense, however, so that the adherents of the new doctrines could interpret it as testifying to their steadfastness and courage. It has always been less common in Germany than elsewhere, though later, in the time of the Enlightenment (q.v.), the implication it carried that the type of Christianity which it designated stood for freedom and tolerance commended it to many. In the nineteenth century it became the shibboleth of the "liberal" ecclesiastical and theological schools; more recently the growth of ultramontanism as a political power has given it a wider currency; and it is very frequent for any non-Roman Catholic to term himself a Protestant, whether he professes Christianity or not.

The adherents of the Reformation at first preferred to call themselves "Evangelicals," while their opponents styled them "Lutherans," "Zwinglians," "Calvinists," etc., thereby emphasizing their sectarian and heretical character, and implying at best that they were a schismatic body separated from the true Catholic Church. The same names were employed by the Protestants themselves in their factional disputes. After 1530 the expression "Adherents of the Augsburg Confession" came into use. The French name, "Huguenots," originated, according to Beza, in Tours, where, the new religionists being compelled to assemble by night, the report spread that they met in honor of a night-specter, *le roi Huguet* (cf. HUGUENOTS, I., § 1).

It is significant that the early Protestants shrank from styling themselves a church, Luther asserting merely that he and his adherents belonged to the Church. The idea that the Evangelicals or the Lutherans were *the* Church arose in connection with the concept of the Church as a school (see below, IV., § 2), helped on by the course of events. It was customary to speak of "our churches" (congregations) and hence, after the churches of the states were consolidated and had adopted more or less generally one creed, the phrase "our Church" came into vogue, and was perverted into "we are the Church."

The German Protestants, when they found it necessary to speak of themselves as a distinct organization, used at first, and as late as the Formula of Concord, the term "Reformed Church." It was after 1580, and during the controversy over the doctrine of ubiquity (q.v.) that the "Lutheran Church" was first heard of, though circumstances did not tend to make the name popular. About 1600 the Calvinists and Philippists began to appropriate to themselves the name "Reformed," and to call those "Lutherans" who differed from them. During the Thirty Years' War this usage became general and was promoted by custom outside of Germany. In France and Holland the Protestants always called their churches "Reformed," implying that they were Calvinistic or Zwinglian rather than Lutheran; and in England other names were given non-Roman Catholic organizations, such as "Established Church," "Presbyterian Church," and the like, none of them being named after any of their leaders.

II. External Development and Present Status: About 1600, or at the outbreak of the Thirty Years' War in 1618, the rising tide of the Reformation had reached the climax of its first impulse, even though the movement had not yet everywhere run its full course, nor had the Counter-Reformation been unproductive of results. In Germany, however, the Protestant estates were the more numerous and the more powerful; the Huguenots in France had attained an assured position by the Edict of Nantes; the northern Netherlands had renounced Roman Catholicism; in England the only question was whether the Established Church or the Puritans should prevail; and the Scandinavian North had become thoroughly Lutheran. In general the Germanic countries retained the gains of Protestantism during the Reformation period. The secure position guaranteed to the Protestants of Germany by the Peace of Westphalia (see WESTPHALIA, PEACE OF; CORPUS EVANGELICORUM) remained substantially unaltered in the eye of the law till the dissolution of the Holy Roman Empire in 1806, and in other respects there was no essential change, the single event which foreboded Protestant loss, the conversion of the royal house of Saxony to Roman Catholicism, resulting merely in the transference of the leadership of Protestant Germany to Prussia; in England and in Scandinavia Roman Catholicism was, and remained, excluded. In France, on the other hand, Protestantism was well-nigh exterminated by the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and there were losses to the east of Germany, in Poland, Bohemia, Austria, and Hungary.

1. Territorial Conquests.

The Enlightenment (q.v.) had great influence upon the external development of Protestantism; it created the idea of tolerance and wrought constantly increasing changes in the position of the State churches. The Reformation had held to the old doctrine of a single Christian Church and but one true Christian faith, and in its way it went as far in actually constituting this Church and faith as the old Church had done. In the opinion of Luther the word of God and the sacraments were the marks of the Church and the faith; and, with Melanchthon's help, he thought he had formulated these marks in articles of faith which might serve as legal bases for deciding between conflicting parties, each of which claimed to represent the Church and the faith. Luther also believed that the Christian authorities should lend their aid to the Gospel, so that, with his approval, the medieval theory of the relations between the Church and the State was carried over into Protestantism. The Peace of Westphalia marked the beginning of the idea of toleration, decreeing that Roman Catholics and Protestants should no longer regard one another as heretics, and providing that in case a Protestant prince went over from the Lutheran to the Reformed confession or *vice versa*, his subjects should be free to follow or not. Furthermore, while in principle it excluded sects from the law, it left a certain measure of freedom to the territories in their treatment of them, thus positing a tacit allowance of toleration. In course of time Pietism and the progress of theological thought

2. Concept of Toleration.

made princes question whether it was to their interest to uphold pure doctrine with too great zeal, while new theories of the relation of Church and State prepared the way for the belief that the State should exercise only a general supervision over the Church and should treat different religious bodies alike. What had lain obscurely in the background of the Peace of Westphalia was now formulated and justified on grounds of natural law, although not immediately and everywhere put fully in practise. Theological toleration was first granted among the Protestants in the Netherlands, where the Remonstrants and other sectarian congregations were tolerated as early as the seventeenth century. Frederick the Great was the first prince in Germany to give freedom to the Mennonites, Unitarians, and others. At present all German states place the Roman Catholic and Protestant Churches *de facto* on an equal footing, and the equality of individuals before the law is guaranteed by the Empire. A Protestant Diaspora (q.v.) has grown up in Roman Catholic territories and *vice versa*. It may be noted that the growth of Protestantism is relatively somewhat greater than that of Roman Catholicism. To the Lutheran and Reformed established churches the United has been added since 1817 (see UNION, ECCLESIASTICAL) and a number of "Free Churches" (see LOWER SAXON CONFEDERATION; LUTHERANS, II. SEPARATE) have sprung up, so that Protestantism in Germany at the present time is highly complex. In almost all other Christian countries toleration was made a principle of the law of the land during the nineteenth century, at least with reference to Roman Catholics and Protestants, in most cases with reference to all sorts of sects, old and new. At the same time the principle of an Established Church has not been abandoned, though it has been restricted. There are still many established or rather privileged churches, both Roman Catholic and Protestant, in Europe. The United States of America and France are the only countries in which there is at present complete separation of Church and State. See the articles on the various countries; also CHURCH AND STATE; COLLEGIALISM; LIBERTY, RELIGIOUS; PARITY; etc.; for Germany, the articles on the states of the empire; BONIFATIUS-VEREIN; GOTTESKASTEN, LUTHERISCHER; GUSTAV ADOLF VEREIN; etc.

3. Later Protestantism.

A characteristic of later Protestantism is the very general tendency of groups to combine, though often by the loosest of bonds. [Gatherings like those of the Evangelical Alliance (q.v.) may be mentioned as manifestations of the tendency. Denominational lines are less closely drawn than of old, there is a disposition to set aside minor differences in the interest of Christian fellowship, and separate organizations have been united in England and America among the Congregational, Methodist, and Presbyterian Churches. Above all, there is an ever-increasing disposition to combine for practical Christian work (see CHURCH FEDERATION).] A "German Evangelical Church Committee" was formed in 1903 as the result of the recognized need of a confederation of the national Churches and to work for their common interests. The missionary activity of the nineteenth century, both at home and abroad, and the manifold forms of benevolent and charitable work which are sometimes loosely comprehended under the term "home missions," are notable and vital characteristics of modern Protestantism (see MISSIONS TO THE HEATHEN; HOME MISSIONS; INNERE MISSION); and articles on work for special classes—emigrants, Jews, seamen, workingmen, etc. [The Bible and Tract societies, societies like those for the Propagation of the Gospel and the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, and many others which will be found described in their appropriate places, may be mentioned as illustrating the great development and achievements of organized Christian work among modern Protestants.] In connection with home missions the work of the Salvation Army (q.v.) is notable, both for its results and because it well illustrates certain differences between German and Anglo-Saxon Protestantism.

4. Numbers and Distribution.

The following table presents an estimate of the total Protestant population of the world (i.e., the aggregate number of communicants and those who may be classed as adherents) based upon the best and latest data obtainable. It attests one of the most striking facts in the history of Protestantism in the last century—its great expansion in North America. The United States has now the largest Protestant population of any land—from 65,000,000 to 66,000,000 (out of a total population of 79,000,000) according to the estimate of H. K. Carroll (in the *Christian Advocate*, reproduced in *Christendom Anno Domini 1901*, ed. W D. Grant, New York, 1902, i. 530–531), which is based upon the census of 1900. Great Britain probably comes next with 38,000,000 Protestants (total population 42,500,000) and Germany third with somewhat more than 35,000,000 (total population 56,000,000). [See NOTE on page 293.]

Reformed Protestantism:		
Great Britain	20,500,000	
Germany	3,000,000	
Switzerland	2,000,000	
Holland	3,000,000	
Hungary	2,500,000	
France	500,000	
United States	65,000,000	
Canada	2,000,000	
Australia and New Zealand	1,500,000	
India	1,500,000	
South Africa	1,000,000	
Elsewhere	2,000,000	
Total Reformed		104,500,000
Lutheran:		
Germany	32,000,000	
Norway and Sweden	7,500,000	
Denmark	2,500,000	
Finland and the Baltic Provinces	6,000,000	
Hungary	1,250,000	
United States	6,000,000	
Elsewhere	750,000	
Total Lutheran		56,000,000
Anglican:		
England	16,750,000	
Scotland and Ireland	750,000	
The Colonies	4,000,000	
United States	2,500,000	
Total Anglican		24,000,000
Protestant missions		5,500,000
Total		182,000,000

With these figures may be compared the following by recent authorities:

	G. Warneck.[1]	Fournier de Flaix.[2]	H. Wagner.[3]	H. Zeller.[4]	H. A. Krose.[5]
Roman Catholics	230,000,000	230,866,533	263,460,000	254,500,000	264,505,922
Eastern Church	115,000,000	98,016,000	126,200,000	114,610,000	117,875,556
Protestants	185,000,000	143,237,625	179,320,000	165,830,000	166,627,109

[1] G. Warneck, *Abriss der Geschichte der protestantischen Missionen*, p. 375, Berlin, 1901.
[2] Fournier de Flaix in *Bulletin de l'Institut international de Statistique*, iv. 2 (1889), 146.
[3] H. Wagner, *Lehrbuch der Geographie*, p. 179, Hanover, 1903.
[4] H. Zeller, in G. Warneck's *Allgemeine Missionszeitschrift*, xxx. 70. Zeller's figures for the Eastern Church are 106,480,000, Orthodox; 8,130,000 " other [Eastern] Christians."
[5] H. A. Krose, in *Stimmen aus Maria Laach*, lxv (1903), 16 sqq., 187 sqq. For the Eastern Church Krose gives Greek Orthodox 109,147,272; schismatic Orientals, 6,554,913; Raskolniks (Russian dissenters), 2,173,371.

III. The Fundamental Principles of Protestantism as Conceived by Luther: A theory of Protestantism which has been widely prevalent makes it consist of a formal and a material principle, the former grounded in the doctrine of the all-sufficiency of Scripture for everything in the Church, the latter in the concept of justification by faith. Attempts to expound the theory have usually suffered from lack of clearness and faulty method, the attempt having been made to construct without sifting the concrete historical material, so that only too often the result has been to confuse the two questions, how Protestantism actually presents itself in history and how the investigator would like it to be. Perhaps the most satisfactory method is to begin with a sketch of certain of the ideas of Martin Luther—admittedly the founder of Protestantism. The chief points wherein Luther appeared as a new messenger of the Gospel may be grouped under the five heads which follow.

1. Norms of Faith. Regarding the Bible as the only indubitable source of authority in religion, Luther rejected the Roman Catholic teaching regarding tradition. Concerning inspiration he stood on the same ground as the Roman Church, but he declared that the latter did not accord to the Scriptures their full rights. In controversy as to whether he might really and justly appeal to the Scriptures, he asserted what has become the distinctively Protestant position—that the Scriptures are not obscure and in need of the explanation of the Fathers, and, secondly, that they have not a twofold sense, a historical and a spiritual, but a literal sense only. Along with his unreserved readiness to follow blindly the authority of Scripture as the word of God—qualified, however, on occasion by recourse to experience—Luther recognized the ecumenical creeds, and with them the old dogmas of the Trinity and the two natures of Christ, which he found confirmed by the Scriptures. It was his method to press forward from the human nature of Christ to true knowledge of God, and this method has always been important in Protestantism. It has regulated the pericopes in the Lutheran Church, has pointed inquirers to the practical way, and has centered attention upon edification and the knowledge of God in the benefits of Christ as the essence of knowledge. Of the creeds, Luther held the Apostles' to be the most important, regarding it as a precious document of antiquity which confirmed his understanding of the Gospel, and appealing to it to prove that he taught nothing new, but only the genuine old doctrine. He consistently represented that the ecumenical creeds formed a bond, and the strongest bond, between the " kingdom of the pope " and the Evangelical churches; and in the dogmas of the Trinity and the two natures of Christ he saw in like manner a certain measure of common ground. On the other hand, while both the Roman Catholic Church and Luther maintained the inspiration of the Scriptures, their mode of treatment was too divergent to permit the German Reformer to feel any special sympathy with the ancient Church on this score.

2. Private Judgment. When Luther fell back upon his experiences with reference to the Bible and Christ, and renounced all church teachings contrary to these experiences after, in his hour of need in the monastery, he had failed to find comfort in what she authoritatively offered him, he followed a conviction of individual responsibility and compulsion which Protestants since his time have designated as " private judgment." In thus exalting his personal religious and moral convictions above authority and tradition he acted in the spirit of the Renaissance. At the same time, while the Renaissance relied without reserve upon the autonomy of the individual, and, in the last analysis, on purely empirical, egoistic, and unmoral individualism, Luther added from the word of God the concept of man created in the image of God, and understood Christianity as both freedom and compulsion. It has ever since been the problem of Protestantism to reconcile the freedom of the world of man, and of the Church, with God's revelation, and to assign to the conscience its proper function as guide of conduct and belief when enlightened by the Gospel, or the law of Christ. Luther well knew the limits of conscience in judging others, and he was willing to leave each one to God, even the heretics if they would only keep silence and refrain from disturbing civil affairs by agitation. For himself, he recognized that he was a debtor to the Gospel, and he asserted his independence in matters of belief only in so far as the new man in him had taken the place of the Old Adam. He never lost the consciousness of sin, and by word and act he made clear the true place of conscience in Christianity.

Luther's concept of justification was derived immediately from the Bible, although he always de-

[NOTE. The tables are necessarily carried back to about the year 1900 because that is the latest date at which anything like general statistics or even estimates are obtainable. It would afford no adequate basis of comparison to take later figures such as are available from some countries when only much earlier figures are at hand for others.—THE EDITORS.]

fined it in the sense and words of Augustinian and scholastic tradition: *justificatio*—"a setting right"—"a making over of the sinful man to a righteous one." His view differed from the Roman only in that this making over comes to pass through faith alone, and not in any way through works or merit. Luther's dissent from Roman teaching developed from opposition to the doctrine of penance as it was then presented. Roman Catholicism taught that justification is attained through the means of grace of the Church, that is, first through baptism, which removes the taint of original sin, then through penance by those who, after baptism, fall into mortal sin. In the monastery Luther became convinced that he had lost the forgiveness and grace of baptism, and with burning zeal he turned to the sacrament of penance. Here the system of laying down stern conditions of absolution, which were almost invariably modified in virtue of the "power of the keys" (see KEYS, POWER OF THE), both terrified him and filled him with doubt. In reading the Pauline epistles, moreover, he came to believe that God offers his grace without conditions and without regard to merit, provided only that there be faith. He likewise came to the conclusion that justification abides, while grace is ever ready for the acceptance of faith without need of any intermediary. It was in asserting this free and unconditional offer of God's grace to faith that Luther broke with the Roman doctrine of justification, which teaches increasing degrees of grace, and that to become worthy to share in grace man must in each degree do "what in him lies."

3. Justification by Faith.

Luther's doctrine of justification is nothing less than a new concept of God. It means that God is love. Love is, to be sure, one of the attributes of God in the Roman Catholic system, but it is there placed after God's freedom and omnipotence, and is not the essence of his being. To Luther God, both as he is revealed in Christ and as he is still concealed from man, is unlimited, positive love. His love is so great and mighty and mysterious that the human mind can not fathom it; it is in every sense too high for reason, and is revealed in Christ, who is God in human form.

To Luther it seemed an incomprehensible misunderstanding when it was alleged that his doctrine of justification opened the way to moral laxity; in his opinion it alone gave real life and constancy to moral earnestness and joyousness. Faith did not free from the obligation of works, but only from excessive valuation of them. The certainty of pardon, he thought, assured to the guilty one that he who pardoned would help, and furnished the strongest impulse to the will to do penance, that is, to forsake sin and perform good works. Luther's opponents, on their part, could not comprehend how he was able to find the Roman Catholic form of penance too lax and yet hold to the thought of a God whose mercy was without limit. But Luther saw no incompatibility in a merciful and a holy God. He believed in a twofold destiny of men, blessedness and condemnation. God's unlimited mercy is the most effective means he can use to win men to the former; not fear, but gratitude, is the strongest motive to obedience; and it is inconceivable that the merciful, pardoning God will not supply moral power where it is needed.

4. New Ethical and Legal Standards.

Luther broke through the external character of the law by explaining it, not as the inscrutable will of God which must be accepted implicitly as a revelation, but as based in the divine nature itself. In like manner the German Reformer transformed the concept of the blessedness of heaven. To the Roman Catholic Church the blessedness of heaven is the "beatific vision," which is the comprehensible aim of a Christianity whose God is blessed by virtue of his exalted nature. For Luther, too, God is blessed according to his nature, but this nature is love, and when one has on earth experienced proof of God's unwavering and unfathomable love in the forgiveness of sins, then there is life and blessedness in the present world, a foretaste of what will be fully enjoyed only in heaven. For the Roman Catholic the ecstatic visions of mysticism are the foretaste of heaven on earth. Luther was at times influenced by mysticism, but he never longed for visions and ecstasies, and his mysticism was only a means of learning and drawing near to God. This new idea of blessedness, with his concept of God, made it possible for Luther to speak of the certitude of salvation; and he could even make confidence in it a Christian duty, since God is love. The thought of God's ever certain grace meant to him, not indifference and weakness on the part of God toward sin, but God's power over sin; and blessedness meant for him, not a morally neutral good, but good as good, and the vital element of heaven.

Luther likewise had a new idea of the content of the good, or the law. For Roman Catholicism the moral law in its final analysis is a collection of statutes commanding and forbidding definite things, a code decreed by God instead of man. For Luther, the law (which the natural man can not understand) becomes a single idea applicable to every individual and every situation. As God is love and can not help giving forth love, so he requires nothing but love from any one. Faith feels an inner compulsion to show forth love, and makes the Christian the servant of all, even while exalting him as lord of all things.

5. Church and Sacraments.

Luther regarded the Church as in principle nothing but a community of individuals. The only necessary mark of the Church is the presence of believers, who are united through Christ, the head of the body of which each believer is a member. The thought of the body of Christ means for Luther that the Church is not an organization, but an organism, which lives in and with Christ himself. Christ's spirit and word are the medium by which the Church works. In Roman Catholic teaching the presence of priests properly ordained is essential to the Church, not the attendance of worshipers; and in so far as the Roman theory is not that of a sacred order, it is expressed in legal ordinances. Luther thinks in principle only of an attitude of mind which can not be expressed in terms of law.

Luther's new ideas concerning the constitution of the Church are developed in his *An den christlichen Adel.* He preferred to say "Christendom" rather than "Church," and in this work he represents Christendom as ordered in estates and callings. He declares that the worldly estates belong to the body of Christ and are on an equality with spiritual persons, both in their religious quality and from the point of view of their moral actions. A rightly chosen priest is no different from a public official, and all men are alike fit for the service which Christ has appointed to Christendom, namely, to work together for the good of body and soul. Luther by no means had in mind only the nobles, to whom he addressed his appeal, but expressly mentioned shoemakers, smiths, and farmers. They must all know that they are all spiritual estates, all equally ordained priests and bishops, to the end that each in his way may be useful and serviceable to the other and help him to live and grow as a Christian in his appointed place.

Luther often declared that, while all are spiritual priests, there are also priests of the Church, that is, those whose duty it is to administer the word and the sacraments. This leads to his theories of the Church in relation to its rites and ceremonies. He never doubted that there should be special provision for all the elements of worship in Christendom; what was new with him was that he distinguished between the concepts "Church" and "organization for public worship," considering the latter, so to speak, as only a province of the former. He found no difficulty, however, in regarding the Church, in its capacity of an organization for public worship, as instituted by God and ordered by Christ, endowed by him with special gifts. Its function is to extend the kingdom of Christ, its foundation the command to baptize. He was convinced that any Christian could read the Bible and profit from it, but he believed that all, himself included, needed also the instruction of well-ordered preaching. He would not, however, have the hearing of sermons made a "commandment of the Church," aiding in salvation by compliance with a law. Hence, in ordering the Evangelical service Luther put all emphasis on the preaching of the word of God, to the end that the Bible might be understood and have its full efficiency as the true means of grace. He put the sacraments by the side of preaching, because in his own experience he had found help and comfort in the sacraments. In his doctrine of the Lord's Supper he retained more of the old doctrines than elsewhere; but he utterly rejected the concept of sacrifice, and put no other interpretation on the mystery of the Supper than that it inspired the trembling, guilty conscience to faith. His regard for church services and rites never became a snare to him. He was convinced that unjust excommunication does not exclude from the Church; he taught that if the priests of the Church will not serve, any Christian brother may officiate in their place; and he regarded parents' reading of the Bible, catechetical instruction, and prayers at home as supplementary to the similar offices of the Church, and filled with the same sort of power.

IV. The Lutheran Church: The historical study of Protestantism leads naturally from Luther to Melanchthon. The part of the latter in the Reformation has given rise to most divergent opinions. Extreme views, such as those which, on the one hand, regard him as a sort of destroyer of true Lutheranism, and, on the other hand, make him the real genius of the Reformation who determined its course, are not justified. Luther was no organizer, and, as a theologian, no systematizer. Melanchthon was both, though with limitations. The word of God could not be presented and made effective without trained preachers who knew how to use the Bible and were in sympathy with the spirit of the time as represented in the Renaissance. His ability to meet this need by making schools and universities, as well as all their teachings, subservient to the preaching of the Gospel was Melanchthon's peculiar gift. Luther recognized this and was not blind to his own restrictions. He justly admired Melanchthon's skill in getting at the kernel and formulating it instructively and systematically, even though the latter's work as the "preceptor of the Reformation" inevitably resulted in a narrowing of Lutheran concepts which was not without momentous consequences.

1. Luther and Melanchthon.

This reduction of Luther's thoughts appears in what Melanchthon has to say of the Church in the third edition of his *Loci* (1543). Interest in the organization and in its officials and specific functions here comes to the front. Melanchthon compares the Church with a school, and considers his definition of it as a *coetus scholasticus* to be a complete refutation of the papal definition of the Church as a kingdom. The Church consists of teachers and taught, who are to be distinguished one from the other, and it must set forth the Bible as the sole truth. In case of doubt as to the meaning of the Bible, the principle to be followed is that the word of God is itself the judge, "with," it is characteristically added, "the confession of the true Church." Luther might have written all this, though to him the Church was more than a school, and the word of God more than a mere matter of teaching. The pastors, or teachers, too, seemed less important to him than to Melanchthon, and he did not lay as much weight as the latter on the harmony of all Church doctrine.

2. The Church a School.

Melanchthon wrote his *Loci* originally as a brief compendium of the great truths of the Bible for the private edification of those who were reading the Scriptures; but in the two later editions he aimed to produce a text-book for the Church as a school, and to collect all the articles of faith and arrange them in proper order This was done primarily for the use and benefit of the teachers in the school (i.e., the pastors), especially as bitter experience with the fanatics had made a theological education seem a necessary requisite for the preacher's office. In all thre editions of the *Loci* justification by faith is the center of pure doctrine, and the chief article of the faith. The entire content of the Bible is arranged under the headings,

3. Melanchthon's System.

"doctrine of the law" and "promise of grace." The law is God's exacting will, the Gospel his helping will. Since Adam's fall, and because of original sin, man's power is so weakened that he can not fulfil the most external requirements of the law, to say nothing of actually pleasing God. Accordingly, the effect of the law is to terrify and produce contrition. The Gospel then reveals God's grace (i.e., his mercy), which is founded in Christ as the mediator and propitiator, and makes justification known as a free favor for Christ's sake, consisting in the remission of sins and assuring of reconciliation or acceptance to life eternal. The Gospel, however, does not abrogate the law, and therefore it requires not only faith, but also conversion. God works through the Holy Spirit, perfecting faith and helping to fulfil the law. The Gospel leads to regeneration, or the restoration of original righteousness, which will be perfected in heaven. Precise definition is highly characteristic of Melanchthon and sometimes leads him to set rather artificial limits to various concepts. He shows an inclination to retain as many of the old institutions as possible, and tries to prove that the Protestant interpretation of the Bible is in harmony with the teaching of the Church Catholic. He presents Luther's doctrine of penance or repentance, though without the force of personal experience which animated it in Luther, and for him conversion lasts practically throughout life. Baptism is the sacrament, or sign, which marks entrance into the Christian life and the state of grace, the transition from the dispensation of law to that of the Gospel. Its efficacy endures for the whole life.

4. Lutheranism and Scholarship.

Having devised the formula of the Church as a school, Melanchthon proceeded to bring the Evangelical faith into connection with Humanism. He started with the old familiar idea of natural law (q.v.), declaring that it is not only approved by the reason, but is also found in the Bible, being in the background of revealed law. God has provided that men shall know his providence from nature and has given them understanding to distinguish between good and evil. By the fall man lost the clear knowledge of the natural law which he had originally possessed. The Gospel brought something wholly new, not indicated in the natural law, namely, redemption through Christ and justification by faith, and this now leads back to the original condition. Certitude is restored by the spiritual law imparted by revelation in the Bible. If, now, as Christian, and by supernatural means, man is again certain about God, the study of the natural knowledge of God has interest and value for him and for the Church. Faith attains to somewhat of the character of rationality by virtue of the natural law, though even this law is supernaturally conditioned as based on the creative activity of God. By means of this concept of natural law Melanchthon succeeded in finding an ideal foundation for the knowledge of the Church in the knowledge of reason no less than scholasticism had done. His theory was, however, only superficial here, for he really had in mind two realms of knowledge: a higher, that of Biblical revelation, and a lower, that of human reason; and he felt that one must first learn of the former to understand the latter. He refrained from high speculations about God, the law, the doctrines of the Trinity, and the two natures of Christ, contenting himself with the belief that all divine secrets would be revealed in heaven. It is significant that he thought of heaven too as a school. He did not appropriate Luther's ethical conception of blessedness. That justice is in itself blessedness, that love is the essence of life everlasting he did not understand. God desires, he held, to be known and honored; and blessedness is the eternal reward of those in heaven to hold converse concerning God and the divine essence, now at last completely known. Herein is the most considerable reduction of Luther's teaching as formulated by Melanchthon.

5. Church and State.

In the interest of the new faith Melanchthon undertook the reorganization of the entire system of higher education, and rendered no slight service to the entire field of science and letters. His *Loci* became the theological textbook of the generations which followed him, and his manuals of philosophy, which he prepared as propædeutic, were no less noteworthy. In this undertaking, however, he needed the help of the secular authorities, and it was he who laid down the rules for the relations between the Lutheran Church and the State. He believed that the magistracy was sanctioned by reason, and also that it was, on unmistakable Biblical authority, positively ordained by God, the secular officials being called to be guardians of the entire law, i.e., the natural law and the decalogue. Revelation defines the sphere of their duties. They must open the way to the pure doctrine of the Bible and regulate the higher institutions of learning; but it is not for them to interpret the Bible or to formulate the faith. Their place in the Church is among those who hear, not those who teach. The preachers, as ministers of the word, are independent, and as authoritative for secular officials as for all other laymen, though in purely civil affairs the clergy are subject to civil authority.

6. Lutheran Orthodoxy.

Lutheran orthodoxy may be treated briefly after depicting Melanchthon's system. It lived and moved in the understanding of the Gospel to which Melanchthon gave words and form, notwithstanding the controversies of Gnesiolutherans and Philippists, and the preference shown for the former when the princes were compelled to take sides (see PHILIPPISTS). For it the Bible was the only actual authority of faith, even the creeds adopted serving merely to settle points of controversy, and the task of theology was to interpret, systematize, and defend in pedagogic fashion what the Bible contained. The classic theologian of the period, Johann Gerhard (q.v.), gave little space to the confessions in his *Loci* (9 vols., Jena, 1610–22) and treated them only incidentally. It is not meant that Gerhard, or any one, was indifferent to the confessions, but he was so fully convinced that they accorded with the Bible and bound to nothing except what was in the Bible that he could give them a very secondary place. It was far more important to show that Lutheranism and the early Church were in harmony,

and that the new teachings were supported by the testimony of the Church Fathers. Practically the confessions were important chiefly on the political side. The Augsburg Confession served as a statement of the Evangelical faith which could be used juristically in dealings between the Lutheran states and the Empire; and the states often felt the need of documents which could be appealed to in matters of uncertainty in their internal church policy.

The most important theological achievement of the time of orthodoxy was a highly developed doctrine of the inspiration of the Bible; controversy with Roman Catholic theologians, especially the well-equipped Jesuits, drove the Protestants, who rejected the Roman appeal to tradition and the Church, to declare the Bible the sure and only word of God, to which they maintained that they could appeal with better right than could their opponents to the pope. At the same time, a consistent and practical intuition of the essence of Christianity was retained. The divine plan for the salvation of fallen man was thought of by many as somewhat more miraculous than by Melanchthon; faith and comprehension of the Bible were considered a purely mechanical operation of the Holy Spirit; the theory of blessedness was still further transformed; metaphysical speculation about God involved consequences which Melanchthon had not had in mind; and new paths were entered upon in the doctrine of the sacraments. On the other hand, the interpretation of *loci* went on quite in the spirit of Melanchthon. Finally, there was a coherence of idea based on the concept of God, that is, on God's interest in the law. The dogma of satisfaction, rendered by Christ to God in place of the sinner, stood in close relation to the thought of law, even of a natural law. In it the orthodox theology showed that it had made Melanchthon's interpretation of Luther its own and was still animated by it. It is no accident that this dogma has been the most lasting part of the orthodox doctrine.

The most striking thing in the piety of the period was its unruffled content. Never since has the Evangelical faith been so sure of its object and so sure that it was right. It must be admitted that the moral impulses to faith were not felt as they were by the immediate disciples of Luther and Melanchthon. There was a sort of habitual acquiescence in the inevitability of sin, and the hope of heaven was a large element of orthodox piety. Men saw no special tasks before them in the world; Melanchthon's teaching had brought about its logical result by putting all ideal direction of life in the hands of the clergy. The people [for the most part] learned the catechism and listened patiently to the instruction of the pulpit; they attended faithfully on the word of God and the sacraments—and with that they were content.

V. The Reformed Church:

1. Character and Foundation. Notwithstanding various creeds and confessions prepared for different lands, it is allowable to speak of the Reformed Church rather than of Reformed Churches, since the characteristic features of these formulations are not essentially different. No more will be attempted here than to note the peculiarities of the Reformed body in comparison with the Lutheran. The latter was the earlier form of Protestantism; for this reason it is necessarily considered first in a historical treatment of the subject. Numerically the Reformed Church is to-day by far the stronger (see above, II., § 4).

Originally the Reformation was a single movement, but before long it was carried forward by very different personalities. The greatest man of the time beside Luther who renounced the ancient faith was Zwingli, though conflict ensued when the two leaders met. This fact was due in great measure to the natural limitations of each, and to Luther's inability to understand his fellow Reformer, particularly with reference to the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, even though the real divergence of the Reformed from the Lutherans on the latter tenet was due not to Zwingli, but to Calvin. Zwingli, however, founded no school, and the only region which can be regarded as Zwinglian, even in a limited sense, is German Switzerland, though a few survivals of his system may be traced in Reformed organization and modes of worship. The true founder of the Reformed Church was Calvin, who was, in some respects, more influential even than Luther.

2. Theory and Use of the Bible. To Calvin the Bible was in a peculiar sense the one thing and everything. This does not imply that he believed more fully in the inspiration of every word than did Luther, or that Melanchthon was less convinced that the Bible alone gives man certainty; but that Calvin took the concept of the whole Bible as the very word of God more deeply than did either Luther or Melanchthon, and it had for him more practical consequences. He applied his theory of the Bible more logically than did Luther or Melanchthon. Luther, like Melanchthon, was concerned primarily only with what "brings Christ," so that he could disregard much of the Old Testament. For Calvin, Christ (or our salvation) is the center of the Bible. But he was in a certain sense more of an exegete than Luther or Melanchthon. He saw much in the Bible which they did not see, and he let much work upon his mind which Luther put off with the reflection that it did not concern Christ, and which Melanchthon, with his pedagogic interests, passed over as too dark or too subtle. Furthermore, Calvin found relations with Christ where Luther did not find them, and he had a more abstract or legalistic intuition of Christ than had Luther. Luther looked into the heart of Christ and there found the heart of God, but for Calvin neither Christ nor God had much heart. He found the doctrine of reprobation in the Bible, and therefore accepted it calmly and unmoved, reserving all recognition of divine mercy and long-suffering for the elect. Luther was disturbed by the twofold predestination which he found in the Bible and pronounced it a riddle. For Calvin this riddle did not exist; he held that what God does is right because he does it; and he ignored the presence of any moral problem.

With this Calvin made the divine motive in creation and redemption not love, but glory, so that he could write (*CR*, xxxvi. 294): "Our salvation was

the care of God in such a way that, not forgetful of himself, he set his own glory in the first rank, and therefore created the world to the end that it should be the scene of his own glory." Divine omnipotence, working evil as well as good, stands first in Calvin's system, preeminent over divine justice, and supreme above every law, whether natural or revealed. This Calvinistic concept of the divine omnipotence was momentous for the Reformed Church because its originator succeeded in convincing many that it is the fundamental Biblical concept of God. Nevertheless, many of the Reformed have revolted against it. Arguments against predestination can be found in the Bible, and therefore this dogma has always been the chief source of controversy in Reformed theology.

With Calvin, as with Melanchthon, the thought of repentance went with that of promise. Repentance must precede, although it does not produce, justification. How repentance manifests itself, what God requires as sanctification, and how the moral demands on the Christian are satisfied, Calvin determined from the Bible as a code of statutory laws. He would have a purification of the acts and forms of life after a Biblical pattern which Luther and Melanchthon never dreamed of. As a matter of fact, he succeeded in divesting Geneva of its old national customs, and everywhere in the Reformed Church appears the same tendency to conform the external matters of life to the words of the Bible in a manner quite foreign to Lutheranism. At the same time, Reformed morality has never spent itself in striving after "apostolic simplicity" and the like, and while the "weightier matters of the law" are never forgotten, there has always been a sharp line of demarcation between the Lutherans and Reformed, as seen, for instance, in the development of Puritanism.

3. Legalism and Other-worldliness.

A noteworthy trait in Calvin's personal piety is due to the large part which the future life had in his thinking. If the world is all for God's glory, the Christian has nothing else to do in the world and in his calling than to serve God. That it is well to fight against every worldly pleasure is the fundamental thought of Calvin's ethics; and the abnegation of self is held to be the height of Christian achievement. The Christian can find joy only in the hope of heaven and in the vision of God in his immediate glory. The Reformed Church, furthermore, shows a tendency to direct its thoughts to heaven in a way which works on the imagination more than is the case with Lutherans. Calvin was no mystic; but the long list of independents and sects among the Reformed shows a propensity to mysticism, ecstasy, and fanaticism. Chiliastic expectations and the like are also more at home among the Reformed than among Lutherans.

Concerning the State, Luther and Calvin agreed only in holding that it had a duty from God with respect to the Gospel. Luther believed that Church and State are independent, each in its sphere, but mutually bound to help one another. Only when the institutions of the Church (bishops, synods, etc.) prove insufficient, is the State called on to intervene outside of its peculiar field (justice, defense, oversight of civil life, trade, etc.). The Church may advise the State, but the latter should finally determine what it will do. It may be inefficient or wholly indifferent, but this does not justify open resistance; the Christian attitude toward the government must then become one of passive endurance (so both Luther and Melanchthon). In marked contrast with this, the Reformed never scrupled to take arms against the State when it opposed them (in France, the Netherlands, England); they held that a government which sets itself against God and the Bible thereby forfeits its rights. Neither may the government decide upon its course of action in concrete cases; its duty is laid down by God in the Bible. The Old-Testament pattern was ever in Calvin's mind; the Old Testament furnished him with his basis of criminal law; and the end in view was to produce a "people of God" by governmental agencies. Unlike Melanchthon, Calvin desired to set up a theocracy, though not a hierocracy; he required obedience to God, to Christ, and to the Bible, not to himself or to the Church.

4. Theocracy and Church Freedom.

While Lutheranism, as a rule, remained subject to the jurisdiction of even unfriendly civil authority, non-German Protestantism assumed a less pliant attitude, even proceeding, as in the case of the Huguenots and Puritans, to armed resistance. This position, however, was not merely caused by surrounding conditions, but was a matter of actual principles derived from the Bible, which also furnished the theory of the internal organization of the Reformed Churches (see PRESBYTER, PRESBYTERATE, II.). The Reformed Church often assumed the character of a State Church, particularly in Zwinglian territory, where ecclesiastical administration even became part of the department of State; but in such cases the State was either so strong or so friendly that no one thought of claiming independence. Secessions have been not infrequent (cf. Scotland). The principle has always been that the Reformed congregation of God is sovereign, subject to but one lord, Christ. All members stand on an equality, and officials are appointed and controlled directly by the congregation as a necessary inference of this independent sovereignty. Church government for Calvin meant independent discipline, whereas the Lutherans made this a duty of the State (see CHURCH DISCIPLINE). In the opinion of Calvin the Church was the congregation. Its rites and ceremonies were a part of the general apparatus for the glory of God, and the pedagogic element in divine service sank into the background. It was a duty to exclude the unworthy. Desire to fulfil this duty led to a most minute and active pastoral care, and, in general, it may be said that the Reformed Church puts more stress than the Lutheran upon this part of the pastor's work. The Reformed Church has also shown great missionary and proselytizing zeal—a direct consequence of its concept of the glory of God as the chief end of man.

The difference concerning the Lord's Supper was originally felt (by Lutherans at any rate) to be the greatest distinction between the two branches of Protestantism (see LORD'S SUPPER for full statement

of both Lutheran and Reformed views and practise), although, as a matter of fact, the bitter controversy was concerned chiefly with differences in the form of the ceremony. The theory of worship differs throughout in the two Churches. Here also Calvinism claimed to follow the Biblical pattern. Calvin tried to arrange all festivals according to the New Testament, but in so doing he had to introduce many "necessary" innovations —Sunday (from the seventeenth century, first among the Puritans, = the Sabbath) as the only holy day (no more saints' days, and scarcely a trace of Christmas), no pictures or images, no candles, no altar (only a table), no vestments, no organ, no hymns (only the Psalms), no liturgy, or a most meager one. Lutheranism, on the other hand, retained all of the old and familiar service that could be interpreted as Evangelical and modeled its liturgy for Sunday and for the Eucharist on the service of the mass. The Reformed Lord's Supper, on the contrary, is held to be based simply upon the apostolic pattern.

5. Lord's Supper and Liturgy.

A noteworthy fact in Reformed church history is the continued production of creeds or "confessions" (as the Reformed prefer to call them). It shows a different attitude toward symbols from that of the Lutherans; the confessions are regarded as actual statements of the chief doctrines, and of late it has sometimes been declared in credal form that this or that tradition is no longer believed in. The great weight laid on the forms of life as well as of the service and constitution of the Church has promoted the growth of sects, since where such things are supposed to be derived from the Bible alone, there is often much room for difference of opinion as to what the Bible requires. Lastly it may be noted that in the time of orthodoxy the Reformed Church was much more productive in scholarship than the Lutheran.

VI. Internal Development of Protestantism since the Enlightenment: In tracing the later development of Protestantism one must guard against praising or blaming it for what has belonged to the progress of civilization and thought in general. Protestantism has contributed some new ideas and has accepted others; while it has taught, it has also learned. A joy and confidence in the evolution of civilization have been manifest among Protestant peoples which have repeatedly brought them into conflict with orthodoxy (see ORTHODOXY AND HETERODOXY) and with current concepts of morality. The later history of this type of Christianity can here be given only in the barest outline, the views and systems of individual leaders, who have been no less influential than in earlier periods, being treated in the special articles on the personages in question.

The great movement of Pietism (q.v.) was, properly speaking, only an earnest attempt to give practical realization to the standards of the time of orthodoxy, especially in private life. The Bible was not made the sole authority of faith and life to the satisfaction of many earnest but one-sided souls. The Protestant Church was distrusted as having become in its way as much bound to its system and as authoritative as the Roman. The Reformed Church, however, for all its precision of definition, had a vein of underlying mysticism, while Lutheranism had an impulse from its founders to interpret repentance and conversion as a violent change in the individual life. The result was that form of Pietism which is, perhaps, the most important—the painful striving of individuals to make their Christian calling sure, and strenuous efforts to attain personal Christianity, true inwardness, and depth. As a whole, however, Pietism exercised a conservative influence on Protestantism, and afforded orthodoxy the new strength to arise to a veritable renaissance after the decline of the Enlightenment in the eighteenth century.

1. Pietism and the Enlightenment.

The Enlightenment (q.v.) gave Protestantism a distinctly new character. It signified for Protestantism as such the letting loose of its secular interests, and in spirit was more akin to the Renaissance than to the Reformation. Clericalism and orthodoxy it regarded as its foes because of their claim to possess an authoritative, divine truth which the human mind might not criticize. The rapid growth of the commerce of England and Holland in the seventeenth century and the wealth which followed brought to these non-Roman Catholic lands questions of all sorts—social, political, philosophical, and religious. Bacon's attempt to found a new practical science was in part a reaction against Melanchthon's method. The time had come for Protestantism to have a deductive philosophy, at least of the world, and it is hardly an accident that, with the exception of the Jew, Spinoza, all great philosophers since Descartes have sprung from Protestantism, and that most of them have had a certain sympathy with it.

As a system Protestantism is intellectual and spiritual rather than liturgical and legalistic. Protestant theology of the seventeenth century addressed itself to the common people. One might say that it aimed to make every Christian a theologian. The specific endeavor was to make the Bible plain and widely known, since only thus, it was believed, could piety be rightly grounded and real. Before the end of the century, however, theologians were rudely disturbed in this work by the demand to judge the results of reason simply by the weight of the evidence for them. When this was applied to orthodox notions of natural knowledge of God and his law, a yawning chasm opened, for theology regarded natural knowledge as a remnant of an earlier knowledge which was supernatural in its origin as was all truth, which is revealed in full in the Bible; and in the background lurked the conviction that the unaided mind is impotent. The doctrines of the Enlightenment set up a new kind of mind, confident in itself, and feeling no need of instruction from religion. There was a revival of the spirit of the Renaissance, which had been repressed by the Reformation, although sympathy with the Reformation was not lacking. Luther had appealed to his experience as a witness to truth (see above, III., § 2), but his time was not able to understand and explain fully the functions of experience in relation to religion. The Enlight-

2. The Passing of Orthodoxy.

enment took up this problem. The controversy in principle concerned the place of supranaturalism in the search for truth. All sorts of compromises were tried by both sides. The enlightened were ready to defend revelation after they had proved that its content agreed with the investigations of reason, and the orthodox reversed the process. Finally, a new point of view was won in a changed apprehension of what is credible.

The contest was fought out chiefly in the fields of the natural sciences and history The faith of the Church, inevitably from its dependence on the Bible, was closely bound up with the ancient notions of the world and the Ptolemaic system. In spite of orthodox opposition, the new Copernican system steadily won more and more the adherence of thinking minds, and the new science even invaded the domain of religion with the so-called physico-theological argument for the existence of God. Herein it vindicated the power of the reason to attain real and sure belief in God. Had the new science issued only in skepticism or materialism, it must have disintegrated Protestantism. But when it brought the proof that reason is capable of independent and convincing achievement in the religious sphere, it opened the way to a general revision of the concept of God with the help of reason. Incidentally it cut at the root of the belief in miracles, and tended to make such things as the belief in a devil, in witches, and in magical powers obsolete in Protestant piety

In the field of history actual experience first shook faith in a special and positive revelation. The wrangling of denominations and sects and the misery of the religious wars indeed justified a doubt whether the true criterion of truth had been found. This was the background of the first deistic essays, which sprang expressly from religious interest. Then came deeper and wider study of past history, an expansion of geographical and ethnographical knowledge, and the first real acquaintance with heathen religions. It had to be admitted that antiquity offers many examples of a noble religiosity, and when it was asserted that all religions have an identical kernel, orthodoxy, because of its theory of a primitive revelation, at least could not deny that this was probable. The way was opened wide to the acceptance, in the name of Christianity itself, of general moral reason as the supreme guide in religious things. Then the very citadel of orthodoxy was attacked. Locke declared the Bible the palladium of rational Christianity, and so simplified its moral teaching that the natural law seemed no longer a hinting at the latter but its real content. The conviction became established that orthodoxy had fallen far short of understanding the Bible.

About the middle of the eighteenth century Protestantism looked back upon its orthodox period as sunken in deep error, and considered pure Christianity the champion of a natural religion, rational in its metaphysics and its morality. The idea of striving after perfection, immanent in the human spirit, and to be educated and molded by Church and State, was now its guiding-star in morals. The solution of its problems, both moral and religious, was sought not so much by laying down statutory requirements as by seeking underlying principles. Differences of individual opinion came to be tolerated, not because of an indifference to truth, but because it was recognized that the way of the Gospel is to convince.

3. Kant and Schleiermacher.

Kant and Schleiermacher, the two greatest thinkers of Protestantism, refined its theological methods and raised it to a new level. Kant's distinction between pure and practical reason accomplished no more than to open up to theology new and fruitful paths of investigation. But his fundamental conception of reason as a law-giving potency was the culmination of the basal idea of the Enlightenment that the spirit is superior to all external nature, and it has permanent and far-reaching religious value in so far as it has reference to no inborn empirically known function of reason, but to one which is to be understood and asserted only in the conviction that the spirit is of supernatural determination. Kant did not contribute much to the understanding of religion, but all the more to that of morality by his doctrine of the autonomy of the moral law. Schleiermacher made the daring attempt to free religion from intellectualism and moralism. His thought that the essence of religion is the absolute feeling of dependence is a profound one; it means that the pious man knows not that he lives, but that God lives in him; he lives not in his own power, but in a power received; he "is lived." Important also in Schleiermacher is the revival of a religious valuation of Christ. His system is loaded down, however, with esthetic and pantheistic notions, and more of the same sort has been brought into Protestantism by the school of Hegel. The most important idea of the latter, that of the consistent development of history, is now being tested.

4. The Nineteenth Century.

The first half of the nineteenth century witnessed a revival of orthodoxy, which was followed by a new pietism that repeated all the excesses of the older in its recoil from the Enlightenment. The eager and fruitful interest in world history which characterized the century had its influence on church history and Biblical history, and made these departments the foremost in theological study. It seems to some that Albrecht Ritschl (q.v.) has rendered a distinct service to Protestantism by his powerful combination of the historical and the religious aspects of the person of Christ, but the time has not yet come for a system of dogmatics on the basis of investigable history. Neither is it possible at present to say what will be the ultimate significance for Protestantism of the latest school, that of comparative religion. It betokens a real gain in its interest in what was once thought alien and remote, while in its antagonism to all supranaturalism it betrays sympathies with the Enlightenment. The social and political changes inaugurated by the French Revolution, and the rapid and unprecedented development of industry and commerce, have brought moral problems which at first inspire more alarm than courage. Under the burden of the day's work and duties it is easy to forget that the mills of God grind slowly. The century has

made the different denominations better acquainted with one another. During the last generation North America has come vigorously to the front in the field of scientific theological work. That the old conceptions of the Bible have their stronghold there at present is not strange. It must be admitted that in both the Lutheran and the Reformed Church the old types everywhere live on in spite of many readjustments.

The rationalizing of the *lex naturæ* gave a new character to the *jus naturæ* as well as to natural religion and morality. During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the State became continually more and more secularized under the influence of the new school of jurists (Grotius, Hobbes, Pufendorf, Thomasius, Pfaff, etc.), who found its basis in the consent of the governed rather than in divine right, and made its aim the welfare of the citizens, at the same time limiting welfare to the things of this world. Under this concept of the State every citizen has freedom, including the privilege of thinking as he pleases so long as he does not disturb public order. Religion becomes a private matter of the individual, and the State renounces all attempts to support and govern or control the Church, except in so far as the functions of the latter have points of contact with the interests and aims of the State. Of course, the old order was not done away with in radieal manner all at once, and governments adopted the new idea in different measure. In general, however, the spirit of the time seemed to threaten the complete disorganization of the Church, especially in Germany, where the existing order rested on the very different conceptions of Melanchthon (see above, IV., § 5). On Reformed territory the danger was less, since the Protestant Churches there were generally independently organized from the beginning (see above, V., § 4). Anglicanism and Scandinavian Lutheranism had also a conserving force in the retention of the episcopate. After the founding of the Union (q.v.) in Prussia there was a reaction, due, in part, to the Reformation jubilee in 1817, which directed attention to the historical origin of Protestantism and the concrete ideas and aims of the Reformers. At present, however, the complete separation of Church and State has begun everywhere in Germany. The fear that as a result the masses would turn away from the Church has, happily, not been realized. The Protestant people still cherish their old church customs, with the possible exception of the Lord's Supper, and the interest shown by the laity in the scientific work of theology is full of promise.

5. Relation to the State.

(F. KATTENBUSCH.)

VII. The Church of England: The Church of England claims to be distinguished from the Protestant Churches, Lutheran and Calvinist, of the European continent (as well as from those bodies which have at a later date separated from her communion), in that at the time of the Reformation in the sixteenth century she retained, along with the ancient creeds, the traditional order of the ministry, with its authoritative commission handed down in successive episcopal ordinations from the apostles. To these two leading elements of Catholic order may be added the retention of the old forms of liturgical worship, translated into English, simplified, and purged of superstitious accretions. With regard to worship, Bishop Jewel in his *Apology for the Church of England* (VI., xvi. 1, London, 1685 and often) says, " We are come as near as we possibly could to the church of the apostles, and of the old Catholic bishops and Fathers; and have directed according to their customs and ordinances not only our doctrine, but also the sacraments and the form of common prayer." In accordance with these principles the Preface of the first English Prayer Book (1549), retained in the present book under the title " Concerning the service of the Church," refers to " the ancient fathers " for the original of divine service, and declares that what is now set forth is " much agrecable to the mind and purpose of the old fathers." The continuous identity of the English Church before and after the Reformation is distinctly asserted in the samc preface, when it is said, " The service in this Church of England these many years hath been read in Latin." With regard to doctrinc, the convocation of 1571 in the canon (*Concionatores*) which required subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles laid down that " Preachers above all things be careful that they never teach aught to be religiously held and believed by the people except that which is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old and New Testament, and which the Catholic Fathers and ancient bishops have collected from that very doctrine." In the same spirit a canon (xxx.) of 1604 explains, " So far was it from the purpose of the Church of England to forsake or reject the Churches of Italy, France, Spain, Germany, or any such like Church [those, that is, which still remained in obedience to the Roman see] in all things which they held or practised, that, as ' The Apology of the Church of England ' confesseth, it doth with reverence retain those ceremonies which do neither endamage the Church of God, nor offend the minds of sober men, and only departed from them in those particular points wherein they were fallen, both from themselves in their ancient integrity, and from the Apostolic Churches which were their first founders." With regard to the ministry, in Europe generally the Reformers separated from the several national churches, and, without bishops (to whom the right of transmitting the ministry was restricted), thought themselves forced to choose between a lesser and a greater evil, the loss of the apostolic succession (see APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION; and SUCCESSION, APOSTOLIC), and the forfeiture of pure doctrine. Later the necessity of episcopal ordination came to be generally denied, and by some the necessity of any inherited ministry.

In England, on the other hand, there was no breach of continuity, no new church was set up. The English bishops, clergy, and laity as a body acquiesced in the changes that were made. It was not until 1570 that Pope Pius V issued his bull deposing Queen Elizabeth, absolving her subjects from their allegiance, and commanding his adherents to withdraw from the English Church. As an evidence of continuity it may be called to mind that one bishop (Kitchen of Llandaff) held his office

through all those troubled times—under Henry VIII., Edward VI., Mary, and Elizabeth—never imagining that he had been a bishop in more than one church. The Preface to the Ordinal (1549; strengthened in 1662)—maintained in all branches of the Anglican communion—lays down the principle that the orders of bishops, priests, and deacons inherited " from the apostles' time " are to be " continued " in the Church of England, and accordingly that no one without episcopal consecration or ordination, either Anglican or other, is to be allowed to execute the functions of bishop, priest, or deacon. The title " Protestant " the Church of England never accepted, though several of her divines have so described her position and theirs, meaning by the term " Reformed and anti-papal," but not using it in contradistinction to " Catholic." Thus Bishop Cosin (in his *History of Popish Transubstantiation*, i. 7, London, 1675) speaks of the English Church as " Protestant and reformed according to the ancient Catholic Church "; and Bishop Sanderson (in the Preface to his *Sermons*, § xxi., London, 1689) speaks of " the true belief and right understanding of the great article concerning the Scripture's sufficiency being the most proper characteristical note of the right English Protestant, as he standeth in the middle between and distinguished from the papists on the one hand, and (sometimes styled) puritan on the other." The same position with regard to Catholic doctrine, worship, and ministry is claimed by the daughter or sister churches of the Church of England, in Ireland, Scotland, the United States of America, and the British colonies. Accordingly the bishops of the whole Anglican communion, assembled at the second Lambeth Conference in 1878, in their Official Letter declared:

" The principles on which the Church of England has reformed itself are well known. We proclaim the sufficiency and supremacy of the Holy Scriptures as the ultimate rule of faith, and commend to our people the diligent study of the same. We confess our faith in the words of the ancient Catholic Creeds. We retain the Apostolic order of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. We assert the just liberties of particular or national churches. We provide our people, in their own tongue, with a Book of Common Prayer and Offices for the administration of the Sacraments, in accordance with the best and most ancient types of Christian faith and worship." ARTHUR C. A. HALL.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The relationship between Protestantism and the Reformation is such that the literature under REFORMATION and related articles may not be passed over. On the history of Protestantism consult: C. G. Neudecker, *Geschichte des evangelischen Protestantismus in Deutschland*, 2 vols., Lepisic, 1844; J. L. Balme, *Protestantism and Catholicity compared in their Effects on the Civilization of Europe*, London, 1849; C. Hundeshagen, *Der deutsche Protestantismus*, 4 vols., 2d ed., Marburg, 1865–66; J. H. Maronier, *Geschiedenis van het Protestantisme, 1648–1789*, 2 parts, Leyden, 1897; J. A. Wylie, *Hist. of Protestantism*, 3 vols., London, 1899; *Report of the Imperial Protestant Federation for 1899–1900*, London, 1900; J. Kunze and C. Stange, *Quellenschriften zur Geschichte des Protestantismus*, Leipsic, 1903 sqq.; G. Frank, *Geschichte der protestantischen Theologie*, vol. 4. *Die Theologie des 19. Jahrhunderts*, Leipsic, 1905; F. H. Gale, *The Story of Protestantism*, London, 1906; J. Meyhoffer, *Le Martyrologe protestant des Pays-Bas (1523–97). Étude critique*, Brussels, 1907; D. Alcock, *The Romance of Protestantism*, London, 1908; K. Sell, *Katholizismus und Protestantismus in Geschichte, Religion, Politik, Kultur*, Leipsic, 1908; E. Katzer, *Luther und Kont. Ein Beitrag zur inneren Entwicklungsgeschichte des deutschen Protestantismus*, Giessen, 1910; J. Santo, *Le Protestantisme. Ses chefs, ses erreurs, ses méfaits*, Paris, 1910; Schaff, *Christian Church*, vi. 43 sqq.

On the theory and principles consult: R. W. Dale, *Protestantism: its ultimate Principles*, London 1874; J. Hoffmann, *Streiflichter auf den heutigen Protestantismus*, Würzburg, 1881; C. W. P Müller, *Die Prinzipien des Protestantismus*, Strasburg, 1883; F. X. Weninger, *Katholicismus, Protestantismus, und Unglaube*, Mainz, 1885; D. H. Olmstead, *The Protestant Faith; or, Salvation by Belief: an Essay upon the Errors of the Protestant Church*, New York, 1885; J. B. Roehm, *Zur Characteristik der protestantischen Polemik der Gegenwart*, Hildesheim, 1889; R. W. Dale, *Protestantism, its Ultimate Duty*, London, 1894; W. Hoenig, *Der katholische und der protestantische Kirchenbegriff*, Berlin, 1894; E. P. Usher, *Protestantism; a Study*, London, 1896; J. B. Roehm, *Der Protestantismus unserer Tage*, Munich, 1897; J. P. Lilley, *The Principles of Protestantism*, Edinburgh 1898; A. H. Gray, *Aspect of Protestantism*, London, 1899; R. McEdgar, *The Genius of Protestantism*, Edinburgh, 1900; J. M. Gibson, *Protestant Principles*, London, 1901; J. B. Nichols, *Evangelical Belief*, new ed., London, 1903; J. Réville, *Le Protestantisme libéral*, Paris, 1903; N. Smyth, *Passing Protestantism and Coming Catholicism*, New York, 1908; W. Bousset, *Faith of a Modern Protestant*, New York, 1909.

PROTEVANGELIUM. See APOCRYPHA, B, I., 1.

PROTHONOTARY APOSTOLIC (PROTONOTARIUS APOSTOLICUS): A member of a Roman Catholic college of twelve (formerly seven) prelates whose duty it is to register papal acts, proceedings of canonization, and similar records of exceptional importance. Clement I. is said to have appointed a notary for each of the seven districts of the city of Rome to record the acts of martyrs. They belonged to the clergy of the Roman Catholic Church and were appointed by the pope himself. In course of time additional notaries were required both inside and outside of Rome, whereupon the earlier " regional notaries " received the title of prothonotaries apostolic in token of their rights of precedence. Besides these acting prothonotaries there were also supernumerary and titular prothonotaries. The latter class, however, who claimed equal rights with the actual prothonotaries, were officially limited by Benedict XIV., Pius VII., and Pius IX. The pope last named, moreover, ruled that for the attestation of documents which are to be regarded as genuine in all Christendom there is no need of a titular prothonotary, but that the regular notaries apostolic suffice, these being appointed for each diocese on nomination by the bishop.

E. SEHLING.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: P M. Baumgarten, *Der Papst, die Regierung und die Verwaltung der heiligen Kirche in Rom*, pp. 287–288, Munich, 1904.

PROTOPOPE. See PROTOPRESBYTER.

PROTOPRESBYTER, ARCHPRESBYTER: Titles used in the early Church to designate the head of the college of presbyters who represented the bishop in case of absence or vacancy of the see (Bingham, *Origines*, II., xix. 18). According to the Justinian Code (I., iii. 42, § 10), there were sometimes several protopresbyters at one and the same church, who seem to have exercised a general supervision over worship. In the East, at the end of the twelfth century and later, the name *prōtopapas* (" protopope ") occurs with similar meaning, and as approximating the functions of the Chorepiscopus (q.v.), although in at least one instance a *prōtopapas* (of

Corfu, 1367) had an almost episcopal position with nine archpresbyters under him (Nicholas Bulgaris, *Katēchēsis hiera*, Venice, 1681, preface). At present "protopresbyter" or "protopope" is an honorary title in the Greek Church. In the Russian Church it designates a minor supervisory office (cf. ARCHDEACON and ARCHPRIEST).

(PHILIPP MEYER.)

PROVERBS, BOOK OF.

Place in the Canon; Name (§ 1).
The Poetic Form (§ 2).
The Introduction, i. 1–ix. 18 (§ 3).
The Central Portion, x. 1–xxii. 16 (§ 4).
The Date of this Part (§ 5).
The Third Section, xxii. 17–xxix (§ 6).
The Closing Section, xxx.–xxxi (§ 7).
Conclusion (§ 8).

The Book of the Proverbs of Solomon, which is known to have consisted of 915 verses in the Masoretic text as early as the time of Jerome, belongs in the Hebrew canon to the three poetic books (Psalms, Job, and Proverbs) which were distinguished by a special system of punctuation from the rest of the writings. It was reckoned to the Hagiographa (see CANON OF SCRIPTURE, I., 1, § 3, c. 4, §§ 1–2), though its position there is not uniform; sometimes the poetical books are preceded by Chronicles (because the latter books begin with Adam); indeed the order of the three poetical books as a separate collection is subject to variations in the manuscripts. The inclusion of the book in the canon was not entirely a matter of course, and was debated at Jamnia, a ground of opposition being found in the contradiction discovered in xxvi. 4–5, and in the character of the passage vii. 7–20. The Hebrew title of the book is the first word, *Mishle*, from *mashal*, a word often used in the Old Testament with various significations, such as proverb, parable, riddle, satirical poem, and the like (I Sam. x. 12; Ezek. xvii. 25, xviii. 2–3; Isa. xiv. 4). The common element in all these meanings is evidently that of comparison, a conclusion which is borne out by the signification of the Assyrian *mashalu*. P. Haupt (*SBOT, Proverbs*, p. 32) goes to the Assyrian *mishlu*, "half," and derives the term from the fact that the proverb is in two balanced propositions. This is opposed by the other fact that in the Hebrew the singular form is used for a proverb, while the theory requires the plural (or dual). Further, the distich formation is not the only one employed in this form of composition; there are proverbs with only one member, and those with three or more (cf. I Sam. x. 12).

1. Place in the Canon; Name.

This introduces the subject of the form of the book. The fact that Proverbs is among the poetical books shows that the ancients regarded it as poetical in form. Some Hebrew manuscripts as well as important codices of the Septuagint preserve it in lines as poetry, though this is not the usual form of the Masoretic text; the characteristics of Hebrew poetry (see HEBREW LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE, III.) are abundantly evident. Thus there are present the parallelism of members and the easily recognizable rhythm. The measure is prevailingly trimeter, combined in distiches, tristiches, or even in longer combinations, while other variations are not uncommon. The collection x. 1–xxii. 16 is composed entirely of distiches in trimeter, of which x. 2 is an excellent example, presenting two propositions or epigrams usually in antithetical relation. Sometimes the distich is composed of 3 + 4 feet, an example of which is found in xiv. 28; or of 4 + 3 feet, as in xii. 1. There are also distiches in tetrameter, cf. xxv. 2–3 or xxvi. 1. But these longer arrangements are lacking in the section x. 1–xxii. 16, also in xxviii.–xxix. It is to be noticed, moreover, that while there are collections of proverbs which are related in subject-matter (x. 2–5, xiii. 2–3, xviii. 6–8), each proverb is in itself a complete whole. It is also true that the longer measures preserve the distich character, the members being sometimes in the form of antithesis, sometimes in that of identity or of synonymous parallelism. Examples of the first have been given above; an example of synonymous parallelism is xvi. 6, while a third variety, called synthetical parallelism, is partly illustrated in xv. 20. But parallelism is not an absolutely invariable form; in thought there is sometimes a progress, as is illustrated by xvi. 3. This last form is not confined to the distich, but appears also in the tristich, though there is always the possibility that the latter is not the original form, cf. the original Hebrew of xix. 7.

2. The Poetic Form.

The book opens with a long introduction beginning with the words: "The Proverbs of Solomon the son of David, king of Israel," and continuing with a statement of the purpose of the collection: "To know wisdom and instruction," etc., i. 1–6. The basis of this tradition of Solomonic authorship is easily discovered in I Kings iv. 32, in which the statement is made that Solomon "spake three thousand proverbs." On the other hand, it is perfectly clear that the statement of the introduction can not apply to the whole book, since in the later parts other authors are named. Still it must be maintained that the writer of the introduction meant to attribute the principal part of the present book to Solomon. The next section of the book is i. 7–ix. 18, which is a connected composition in longer or shorter collections of verses, in which the reader is addressed as "my son," and the speaker is characterized as teacher or instructor, who admonishes in the name of wisdom (i. 20). In this the form of parallelism is often preserved, sometimes in a long series of verses (chaps. ii.–iii.), and sometimes Wisdom herself is represented as the speaker (i. 20, viii.). The contents reach their climax in the exhortation to receive and cherish wisdom, though exactly what this wisdom is is not expressly stated. What is clear, however, is that the wise is to look for salvation or success, the fool for the contrary; that wisdom is of God and that the fear of him leads to wisdom. Indeed, not only is wisdom of God, it was before the worlds and was present with him in creation (viii.), and is his throne companion. The reader is warned against grave sins and given rules for guidance in practical affairs; by following these is the blessing of God attained, and an ethical content is injected. The morality is

3. The Introduction, i. 1–ix. 18.

therefore not on a high level. Both prophetic preaching and priestly exposition of the law are missing; what is present is everyday morality, wisdom for common life, but upon a religious basis, without deep probing of religious and ethical problems, and containing an element of speculation. The author thinks of wisdom as an emanation from a personified divine wisdom which was preexistent along with God. He paints like a poet-philosopher. The absence of direct data makes it difficult to assign the date of this part of the book. One must suspect a reliance upon Greek philosophy, and this points to the middle or end of the period of the Babylonian exile, without indicating a more exact date. Through Asia Minor a connection can be made with Greece and Greek ideas at that time, though the period of Alexander seems more likely. One must notice the universalistic rather than Israelitic turn in such passages as viii. 4, in confirmation of this dependence upon Greek thought. But it has been shown that even in preexilic times it is possible that Greek culture penetrated into Palestine, especially through the medium of the Greek merchant.

4. The Central Portion, x. 1-xxii. 16.

The second chief part of the book, x. 1–xxii. 16, is the most comprehensive and characteristic, the center about which the rest has gathered. Wisdom as a personification, while not entirely absent, is much less prominent here than in the first part. The connection of the proverbs one with another is external in the main—each proverb has an inherent right to exist apart from its context. No extended discussions are found, though such short treatments are to be seen as xvi. 10–15, or that in xvi. 1 sqq., developing the theme: Man proposes but God disposes. The contents are again that of lay morality, practical wisdom in daily life; righteousness receives its sure reward and lays hold on life, godlessness leads to destruction. Amid occasional touches of quiet humor (cf. xi. 22, xv. 17) is found a serious emphasis upon morality; such virtues are emphasized as contentment, friendliness, patience, sympathy, and especially of humility as opposed to pride. Stress is laid upon a benevolent attitude (x. 12, xiv. 31), and upon trust in God (xx. 22) who sees all (xv. 3, 11, xvi. 33). Beneath all this there is a philosophy of life based on genuine religious feeling (xiv. 34). Indeed, this part as compared with the first part of the book involves in the background a personality or a period of richer ethical and religious experience. Here speculation is at a minimum, and the section seems to have come out of the time of Israelitic prophecy. To be sure the collection is not one which originates in the prophetic circle: the contents are gnomic, they come from the laity, out of the bosom of the common people, they smack of the citizen's and tradesman's life; they do not bear the hall mark of the clergy whether of prophetic or priestly type. They show that the laity had, so to speak, its own morality and its preacher, expressed and speaking in short sentences the wisdom of life. Nevertheless, what is here found shows the direct influence both of prophetic ideals and prophetic preaching. Without reaching the depth and earnestness of prophetic discourse, the impression made here is that the prophets had been heard where this part originated. Once more, the treatment of the kingdom shows that the speaker drew his remarks not from something heard but from immediate experience; he and his contemporaries knew well what court life was (xvi. 15, xviii. 16, xix. 12). And the kingdom can have been no other than that of preexilic Israel, as the treatment does not suit conditions during the Persian or Seleucidean period. To be sure, there is the possibility of considering the residence at the Ptolemean court; but internal grounds negative this possibility. The pictures are those of Palestinian life, and the entire atmosphere and attitude toward the kingdom bespeak a native, not a foreign, court.

5. The Date of this Part.

The one item which seems to speak for a late date—in that case, not earlier than the Ptolemies—is the conception of the king as judge and not as warrior. This feature would indeed suit the Ptolemaic times, when Jewish national wars were not waged, and the function of the king toward the Jews was almost solely that of a judge. Then it would have to be assumed that the author made frequent journeys to the court, as was possible through the close connection of the two lands in that period. But this consideration is not decisive, for in earlier times the king had the functions of judge (cf. Solomon's practise and II Kings iv. 13); and in the daily life of the citizen, concerned with the traffic and business in which the proverbs deal, the matters of war would easily drop out of sight (cf. the practical maxims of xi. 15, xx. 16). The credit of the merchant's business appears here, already a matter of habit firmly established. Against the earlier dating proposed above there seems no conclusive objection. The absence of proverbs dealing with idolatry or polygamy does not prejudice the case. In all probability, monogamy was the rule before the exile; and so far as idolatry is concerned, worship of Yahweh was certainly the rule. In a collection of proverbs which has in mind essentially the life of the citizen and which is formulating rules for guidance of that life, thus dealing with civil and personal well-being, warnings against polytheism would hardly be expected. The author left that province to the prophet and the priest. The matter of religious individualism can not weigh in the argument to prove the book postexilic. To be sure, individualism received a great impetus through Jeremiah and developed largely after the exile. But before that time certain relations could not be treated otherwise than as personal and individual. The Covenant and the Decalogue are natural laws for the people, but they depend upon the personal relations of individuals. The varied relations of life—danger, sickness, lying, adultery, fidelity—are in the last analysis individual affairs. Cornill has alleged the presence of ideas which are certainly postexilic, such as emphasis upon love (x. 12), charity (xiv. 21), creation of the wicked for the day of evil (xvi. 4). But when the possibility is suggested that this and that proverb of later times goes back to a basis in earlier conditions, the certainty of a postexilic origin vanishes. Exilic and postexilic emphasis upon these ideas involves their existence in the life of the citizen in

earlier times—indeed they appear in prophetic discourse. The linguistic argument has also been used to press for a late date, the basis being the presence of "late Hebrew" and "Aramaic" words. Without reckoning words which are doubtfully deemed "late Hebrew" as occurring in Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the priestly writings, there remain forms which are erroneously counted Aramaisms, and a few words or forms which are only possibly late or Aramaic. Similarly some constructions counted as Aramaisms can be otherwise accounted for. When these cases are removed the number of undoubted Aramaisms which remain do not amount to a proof that the section is of postexilic origin.

A third part follows in xxii. 17–xxiv. 22, usually regarded as an appendix to the part just considered; but it differs both in form and in content. In form it is a letter or exhortation to a young man whose parents still live (xxiii. 22); it is designated as "words of the wise" (xxii. 17), and the substance is set forth in a series of lines of poetry. Among exhortations to rectitude and kindness appear warnings against indulgence in wine, unchastity, and unbecoming behavior in business and society. The king is mentioned, but in the general sense of "ruler" (xxiv. 21) and not involving a Palestinian kingdom. The general situation and style make this part seem nearer in date to the first section than to the second. Another little appendix (xxiv. 23–34) begins with the words: "These also are of the wise," and the last two verses repeat vi. 10–11. A larger collection is found in xxv.–xxix., with a heading of its own (xxv. 1), and in character it closely resembles the second part of the book. The derivation of the Hebr. *mashal* from the verb meaning "to compare" is strengthened by the fact that in this section many individual sayings consist of comparisons drawn from the regions of nature and of human life. Practical wisdom is here also emphasized—right speech, right conduct in crises, scorn of folly, form the principal themes. Occasional sayings denote a sharp observation of passing events (xxv. 26, xxvi. 11). A curious fact appears in this part, viz., that against the rule of the book prophecy is definitely recognized (xxix. 18), though at first glance as something lacking or past, but in reality demanding the present existence of prophetical direction. It is noticeable that the king is prominent in the foreground (xxv. 2–7) as a contemporary institution (xxix. 26, xxx. 27–28, 31). While the form of the title "king of Judah" presents a certain difficulty, there is no inherent and stringent improbability in the attribution of the collection to Hezekiah, though the title may be later than that king's time. The question of how much of the material in this section, which is probably made up of matter from various periods between Solomon and Hezekiah, is traceable to Solomon and his times can only be answered by saying that while the correctness of the attribution of proverbs to Solomon is doubtless correct, to assert that this or that proverb is his is beyond possibility. The passage xxv. 2 can hardly have had a king as its author.

6. The Third Section, xxii. 17-xxix.

The close of the book is composed of three small sections which follow in the way of addenda to the rest of the work. The first embraces chap. xxx., headed by the title which should read, "The words of Agur ben Yakeh of Massa" (cf. I Chron. i. 30). The following context is probably corrupt and to be corrected: "I am greatly troubled, O God, troubled and wasted away," this touching confession proceeding in verses 2 sqq. After this come sayings in somewhat novel form, some in the shape of riddles; verses 11–14, dealing with the godless, are also in strange construction, lacking a predicate; in v. 15 is mentioned the vampire [R. V. margin], a weird, perhaps demonic, being, with her daughters; while verse 31 contains a word which seems more Arabic than Hebrew. Marked individualities appear in this little piece—the four "who's" in verse 4, the four "way's" in 19, and others. A similar style is to be found only in vi. 16–19 in this book, though the exact method of naming first a certain number and then increasing that number by one is peculiar to this chapter in the canonical writings (cf. Ecclus. xxiii. 16, xxv. 7, xxvi. 5, 28). It would be interesting to discover who this Agur ben Yakeh is. The name has not an Israelitic sound, and individual words and phrases suggest an Arabic or Arabic-Aramaic or Edomitic origin for the piece. This does not answer the questions raised, for then one asks how out of such origins comes a piece which fits in so well with what a worshiper of Yahweh might have said. Somewhat similar is the little piece xxxi. 1–9, the title of which is to be read: "The words of Lemuel, king of Massa, which his mother taught him." So it seems that Massa is the name of a country, and, from the Aramaisms in the piece, Massa may have lain east or northeast of Palestine. The piece contains exhortation to rectitude and warnings against the contrary. The close of the book is an acrostic in praise of a virtuous woman. There is no datum, internal or external, suggesting the date of these last pieces. The first two must have been appended at a time when the book was otherwise practically complete; and xxx. 6 seems to look to a time when the "word of God" had received canonical assent. But then—what does the expression "word of God" mean, especially in a non-Israelitic writing?

7. The Closing Section, xxx.-xxxi.

Thus the book in its present form is made up of several parts. The earlier dates given in the preceding discussion are the limits before which the collection could not have been begun—those limits are not determined by the date of the latest parts, though these, of course, mark the earliest date for the redaction of the entire work and bring that down to postexilic times, but just when in that period is the question. Much depends upon the degree of Greek influence exhibited. Ecclesiasticus is a book so like Proverbs, and also one the date of which is closely fixed, that comparison of the two is invited; it is, moreover, a branch from the same stem as that from which Proverbs sprang. Gasser has shown with great assurance the dependence of Ben Sirach upon the book of Proverbs, in which it appears that Ben Sirach regarded Proverbs as one of the old possessions of his people, from which he

8. Conclusion.

drew and which molded his thought. If this be true, the redaction even must be put considerably back in postexilic times, since to Sirach it appeared, like Psalms and like Job, to be one of the patriarchal books of which he was so diligent a student. This would carry it back at least to the third or fourth pre-Christian century. It is noticeable that while Sirach makes mention of the king only four times, in Proverbs the king appears more than thirty times. Not only that, but the relation of nearness and intimacy with the court which appears in Proverbs is wholly lacking in the representations of Sirach. (R. KITTEL.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Questions of introduction are dealt with in the commentaries (see below), and also in the special works on Biblical introduction. An excellent little work is W. T. Davison, *Wisdom Literature of the O. T.*, London, 1894. Consult further: R. Stier, *Der Weise ein König*, Barmen, 1849; idem, *Die Politik der Weisheit in den Worten Agurs und Lemuels*, ib. 1850; P. de Lagarde, *Anmerkungen zur griechischen Uebersetzungen der Proverbien*, Göttingen, 1863; J. Dyserinck, *Kritische Scholien bij de Vertaling van het Boek der Spreuken*, Leyden, 1883; H. Bois, *La Poésie gnomique chez les Hébreux et les Grecs*, Toulouse, 1886; T. K. Cheyne, *Job and Solomon*, London, 1887; idem, *Founders of Old Testament Criticism*, pp. 337 sqq., ib. 1893; idem, *Jewish Religious Life after the Exile*, New York, 1898; A. J. Baumgartner, *Étude critique sur l'état du texte du livre des Proverbes*, Leipsic, 1890; C. F. Kent, *The Wise Men of Ancient Israel and their Proverbs*, Boston, 1895; R. Pfeiffer, *Die religiös-sittliche Weltanschauung des Buches der Sprüche*, Munich, 1897; H. P. Chajes, *Proverbia-Studien zu der sogenannten salomonischen Sammlung*, Berlin, 1899; M. D. Conway, *Solomon and Solomonic Literature*, London, 1899; O. Meusel, *Die Stellung der Sprüche Salomos in der israelitischen Litteratur und Religions-Geschichte*, Leipsic, 1900; M. Friedländer, *Griechische Philosophie im A. T.*, Berlin, 1904; J. C. Gasser, *Die Bedeutung der Sprüche Jesu Ben Sira für die Datierung des althebräischen Spruchbuches*, Gütersloh, 1904; E. Sellin, *Die Spuren griechischer Philosophie im A. T.*, Leipsic, 1905; *DB*, iv. 137–143; *EB*, iii. 3906–3919; *JE*, x. 226–232.

A fine list of the early commentators is given in Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire*, fasc. xxxiii., cols. 801–802. The best commentary for English readers is by C. H. Toy, New York, 1899. Others are by: G. Holden, London, 1819; C. Umbreit, Heidelberg, 1826; E. Bertheau, Leipsic, 1847, new ed., 1883; C. Bridges, New York, 1847; J. C. Vaihinger, Stuttgart, 1857; E. Elster, Zurich, 1858; F. Hitzig, ib., 1858; O. Zöckler, Leipsic, 1866; W. Arnot, *Laws from Heaven for Life on Earth*, London, 1869; H. F. Muhlau, Leipsic, 1869; M. Stuart, new ed., Andover, 1870; J. W. Harris, New York, 1872; J. Miller, ib., 1872; F. Delitzsch, Edinburgh, 1877; A. Rohling, Mainz, 1879; J. Dyserink, Haarlem, 1884; H. Deutsch, Berlin, 1885–86; S. C. Malan, London, 1890; W. J. Deane, S. T. Taylor-Taswell, and W. F. Adeney, in *Pulpit Commentary*, New York, 1891; R. F. Horton, in *Expositor's Bible*, ib., 1891; G. Wildeboer, Tübingen, 1897; W. Frankenberg, Göttingen, 1898; H. L. Strack, 2d ed., Munich, 1899.

PROVIDENCE.

Classical Theories (§ 1).
Old-Testament Data (§ 2).
The Apocrypha (§ 3).
In the New Testament (§ 4).
Patristic and Scholastic Teaching (§ 5).
Early Protestantism (§ 6).
Protestant Scholasticism (§ 7).
Pietistic and Modern Views (§ 8).
Critical Conclusion (§ 9).
Subsidiary Problems (§ 10).
Supplement (§ 11).

In the wider sense of the term providence denotes the exercise of God's wisdom, omnipotence, and goodness; while in the narrower sense it signifies the guidance of the world toward the end appointed by God. The doctrine of divine providence in the Christian Church has its origin in the union of the Old and New Testament religion with the philosophical speculation of classical antiquity. These two elements must first be discussed, and then the chief stages of the development of the dogmatic teaching, this being followed by a critical and systematic investigation of the whole development in its Biblical and dogmatic form.

1. Classical Theories.

Greek popular mythology represents the world and the life of man as being under the protection and direction of the gods, thus affording the foundation on which Greek philosophy erected its systematic treatment of providence. Heraclitus gave an imaginative form to the concept of a world-directing reason, an orderly development of things proceeding from the harmony of opposites by an endless process of transmutation. Trust in this divine process was made the highest good of man. Anaxagoras introduced the idea of the cosmos, the harmonious movement of tremendous masses under the direction of reason, which was the essence of both thought and power, and an element neither mingled with grosser matter nor endowed with personality. The theological explanation of the world remained, however, limited to inorganic nature; and Diogenes of Appollonia was the first to bring organic life within the scope of teleology. Socrates reversed the tendency of the ancient philosophers, making man the central point of his teaching and valuing the world according to its utility to man, his views resting on practical monotheism. The Greek dramatic poets, especially Sophocles, also taught the absolute justice and wisdom of divine providence. Following his teacher Socrates, Plato, in his theory of ideas, developed a complete system of teleological metaphysics, making the supreme idea the idea of the good, which is identical with world-reason and with divinity. A spiritual personality was of less concern to him than a moral direction to the world-process, but at the same time he maintained the existence of providence in matters both great and small, holding that whatever fate the gods bestow on the righteous is for his good (" Republic," x. 612 E). This position, represented by Plato chiefly in figurative terms, was taken over and given a purely intellectual form by Aristotle, who formulated and established scientific monotheism, though in his scheme there is no room for the concept of providence. Stoic philosophy, on the other hand, made the thought of providence a prominent factor. While Epicurus banished the gods from the world, the Stoics accepted the divinity as the life-giving principle, the original source of power, the directive reason, the all-controlling providence. God and the world are one, and the world-order is controlled by providence acting through necessary processes, each link in the chain of phenomena being closely bound to

the other by the laws of cause and effect. In applying this principle of providence to detailed considerations, however, the Stoics too often vitiated their position by their constant attempt to find some utilitarian purpose for man's benefit in every natural phenomenon. The Neoplatonists lost the Stoic concept of providence altogether, making the deity entirely transcendent, and filling the gulf between him and man by intermediary beings which were not without influence on Christian views of providence. Classical, and especially Stoic, elements are also visible in the apocryphal literature of the Old Testament, which presents a peculiar blending of Hellenistic concepts and Jewish beliefs.

The Old Testament shows a long course of development of the belief in providence. Traces of earlier and lower ideas, common to all the Semites, are found late in the period of the kings. There was, however, a determined effort to secure the uncontested recognition of monotheism in Israel, an essential element of this belief being the doctrine of providence. The preservation and continued development of the order of nature depend upon the divine will. Atmospheric phenomena are regarded as due to the immediate activity of God (Job xxxvi. 27–28, xxxvii. 2–6, 10–13, xxxviii. 25 sqq.; Ps. xxix. 3 sqq., cxlvii. 16–18), all this ultimately being for the benefit of man. He draws man from the womb and guards him throughout the life to which he himself appoints the limit (Ps. xxii. 10 sqq.; Job xiv. 5). The divine protection rests especially upon his chosen people Israel (Ps. cv.; Hos. xi. 1 sqq.), keeping them from all peril and nourishing them (Ex. xiii.–xvi.; Num. xi.; Ps. xci., cv.–cvii.). While in punishment he hardens the heart and sends evil thoughts (Ex. vii. 3; II Sam. xxiv. 1), he can render evil intents futile and turn them to good (Gen. l. 20; Ps. ii.); and fertility and drought are instruments of blessing and of punishment in his hand (Deut. xxviii. 12–23). The Old-Testament belief in providence reached its acme in its concept of miracles, though since both extraordinary and ordinary events were regarded as being equally the free and deliberate acts of God, the difference between the two was held to be merely one of degree. God is the author of evil as well as of good (Isa. xlv. 7; Lam. iii. 38; cf. also Ex. iv. 21, xiv. 17; Deut. ii. 30; Josh. xi. 20; Judges ix. 23; I Sam. ii. 25, xvi. 14, xviii. 10, xix. 9; II Sam. xxiv.; Amos iii. 6), such evil being usually punishment for sin (Ex. xx. 5; Lev. xxvi.; Num. xi. 33; II Sam. xxiv.; Ezek. xviii.; Joel i.). Since, however, the doctrine that good and evil fortune were given in accord with the character of the individual did not seem to be confirmed by actual experience, attempts at reconciliation were made. In Ps. xxxvii., xlix., and lxxiii. the view is advanced that the seeming prosperity of the wicked is only transitory, while the blessedness of the good is ultimate and enduring. Nevertheless, this failed to solve the problem, which was worked out in the lesson of the life of Joseph (Gen. l. 20) and in the theodicy of the Book of Job.

2. Old-Testament Data.

Allusion has already been made to Stoic influence on the apocryphal writers, who even borrowed from the phraseology of the pagan school. According to the Wisdom of Solomon, the divinity governs and directs all things (Wisd. of Sol., viii. 1, xii. 18, xiv. 3, xv. 1), ordering everything well and righteously (viii. 1, xii. 15). God's mercy, however, mitigates and delays punishments (xi. 23–26, xii. 2) which are in themselves only a form of fatherly correction (xi. 10). Ecclesiasticus, on the other hand, emphasizes the freedom of the human will (Ecclus. xv. 11–17), and, while recognizing the antithesis of good and evil (xlii. 24–25), declares all the works of the Lord to be good (xxxix. 33–34). The increasing power of a belief in immortality in Judaism lent essential aid to the problem of the theodicy which Ecclesiastes had surrendered in despair (cf. II Mac. vii. 9, 11, 14, 20, 23, 29, 36–38). The passages in which Josephus ascribes divergent views to the Pharisees and Sadducees regarding divine providence and the freedom of the will (*War*, II., viii. 14; *Ant.*, XVIII., i. 3, XIII., v. 9) are obscure, but probably imply that the Pharisees believed that divine providence governed all things, so that every human act, whether good or evil, involved the cooperation of God. The sect accordingly maintained the tenets both of divine providence and omnipotence and of human freedom and responsibility; while the Sadducees seem to have laid preponderating stress on the human element, as the Essenes on the divine.

3. The Apocrypha.

In direct continuity with the Old Testament, as well as in consequence of personal experience and original revelation, Christ taught the Father as an omnipotent and holy will inspired by infinite goodness, as the king, judge, and moral law-giver, and as lovingly watching over all mankind. God is, indeed, " Lord of heaven and earth " (Matt. xi. 25), and protects all things, even the most minute and humble (Matt. vi. 25–30, x. 29–31; Luke xii. 6–7). Though the courses of nature are for the benefit of the good and evil alike (Matt. v. 45), yet God harkens especially to the prayers of the righteous (Matt vii. 7–11; Mark xi. 23–24; Luke xi. 9–13, xvii. 6, xviii. 1–7). There is, therefore, no reason to fear need or danger (Matt. vi. 31–33, x. 19–20; Luke xii. 11–12), for even though the bodies of the righteous be slain, they shall receive the kingdom of God (Matt. x. 28; Luke xii. 32). God also has power over temptation (Matt. vi. 13, xxiv. 22), and in the divine omnipotence (Matt. xix. 26; Mark x. 27, xiv. 36; Luke xviii. 27) is implied a practical theodicy which gives clear expression to the mighty optimism of faith. While the connection of evil and sin is by no means ignored (Matt. ix. 2), Christ expressly teaches that the degree of evil is not necessarily commensurate with the degree of sin, but that the danger of punishment with like penalties should serve as an impulse for the fulfilment of the divine commands (Luke xiii. 1–5).

4. In the New Testament.

In the apostolic and post-apostolic age the words of Jesus, sprung from his immediate consciousness of divinity, were formulated into theology. This was especially the case with Paul, whose doctrine of providence is best set forth in Rom. viii. 28–39.

The reconciled child of God forms part of the closely linked chain of divine acts of grace which reaches back into the eternity of the plan of salvation depending on election, and which stretches forward to the future and eternal fellowship of Christ. The act of God, being absolutely free, can not be broken or made of none effect. Since, moreover, the unchangeable love and fatherly protection of God free the believer from the sense of guilt and from the evil in the world, a religious interpretation is given to the concept of omnipotence. Having this certainty, Paul has no occasion to discuss theoretical difficulties which do not exist for the religious soul, so that both the absolute working of God and the moral freedom and responsibility of the believer are taken for granted. Thus, on the one hand, God accepts and rejects according to his will (Rom. ix. 18), the very purpose of divinely caused unbelief being the exercise of divine mercy (Rom. xi. 32). Faith is ascribed to divine calling (Rom. viii. 29), and the preservation and perfection of the believer are likewise due to God (I Thess. v. 23; I Cor. i. 8–9), on whose will the minutest details of life are made contingent (Rom. i. 10; I Cor. iv 19). On the other hand, the apostle appeals to the human will (Rom. xii. 1; I Thess. ii. 11–12; Phil. i. 27; Col. i. 9–10); and in Phil. ii. 12–13 both aspects of the problem are combined. Elsewhere also the good deeds of the faithful are regarded as God working within him, though there is no hint of synergism. In the epistles to the Galatians and the Romans the outlines of a religious philosophy of history are given. The loving counsels of God, to make the world his kingdom wherein man may share, are shown not to have been thwarted by Adam's fall (I Cor. ii. 7; Rom. viii. 29). All creation strives toward the goal set by divine grace (Rom. viii. 18–23; I Cor. xv. 24–28); and in Rom. ix.–xi. is given that magnificent concept of the world-ruling ways of God for the realization of divine salvation which has aptly been termed the Pauline theodicy. The summary of Paul's doctrine of providence is found in the words, "All things work together for good" (Rom. viii. 28). Earthly suffering and earthly evil are the means whereby man is brought into fellowship with the sufferings and death of Christ, and are the path by which man becomes a partaker of the life and glory of the Savior (Rom. v. 3–4, viii. 18; II Cor. iv. 17–18; Phil. i. 29, iii. 10–11, 20–21; Col. iii. 1–4). Though in the post-Pauline portions of the New Testament the doctrine of providence is not brought into so close a connection with the atonement, it is based throughout on the presupposition of the fatherly goodness and love of God. The believer is urged to cast all care on God, who cares for him (I Pet. v. 7), and for this reason perfect contentment is stressed (Heb. xiii. 5–6). All things must be regarded as subject to the divine pleasure (James iv. 13–15). Through faith in providence the Christian gains the right attitude toward the earthly ills that he experiences, knowing that they are but the chastenings of a father (Heb. xii. 5–11), tests of patience and faith (James i. 2–4, 12), and glorification of God if they be endured in the name of Christ and for his sake (I Pet. iv. 12–16).

5. Patristic and Scholastic Teaching.

Early patristic literature shows the influence of Greek philosophic thought, since its interest in the doctrine of providence is mainly cosmological. According to Clement, denial of providence is not merely denial of Christian doctrine, but of the very existence of God, and merits punishment rather than refutation. Both Clement, Origen, and the later Greek Fathers sought, moreover, to solve the problem of theodicy, stressing human freedom and responsibility, and at the same time exempting God from all blame for the existence of evil by declaring that evil is not positive, but is mere negation. The interest of the Greek Fathers in the theory of providence was, however, by no means exclusively theoretical; they used it as a distinct motive for a living trust in God amid all the sufferings and calamities of earthly life. Western teachers likewise represented belief in providence as a part of natural theology. Augustine especially took an epoch-making position toward the entire problem, rejecting the concepts of both chance and fate, and holding that divine providence operates in all things, no matter how minute or obscure. His theodicy shows a combination of Christian and Neoplatonic concepts, evil being merely the negation or absence of good, and the imperfect and incomplete serving to exalt the perfection of the whole. Evil may, however, also be either a punishment of the wicked, or a means of testing, strengthening, and perfecting the good. God permits the existence of evil only that he may turn it into good, so that all exercise of human freedom subserves the plan of providence, nor can the wicked in any way thwart the divine will. All these concepts are elaborated in the *De civitate Dei* into a masterpiece of Christian philosophy of history; and a similar point of view is represented in the *De gubernatione Dei* of Salvianus, in which the history of the world is interpreted as the divine judgment of the earth. In their endeavor to explain the problem of the theodicy Anselm and Abelard took the optimistic point of view that the present world was the best possible, although Hugo of St. Victor regarded this position as limiting God's omnipotence. It was Thomas Aquinas, however, who gave the doctrine of providence an extraordinary scope. Creation and conservation are identical so far as God's activity is concerned, and differ only in respect to the secondary causes which mediate the divine activity. The will of God acts normally through secondary causes; when it acts directly and without them, a miracle is worked. In the governance of God, however, reason and method must be differentiated, the first being immediate and the second mediate. Not alone in his determinism but also in his teaching of predestination Thomas harks back to Augustine, regarding both foreordination and reprobation as special forms of divine providence; while in his theodicy, in which he likewise follows Augustine, he even states that God is, in a sense, the source of evil as well as of good, since "the perfection of the universe requires that not only should there be incorruptible things, but also corruptible ones." The increasing tendency of medieval thought to break with Augustinianism

was strongly resisted by Thomas Bradwardine and by Wyclif, the latter especially maintaining that all events occur of necessity. The question of providence was not discussed in the decrees or canons of the Council of Trent. The Roman Catechism, however, prepared at the direction of the Council of Trent, teaches that after the completion of creation the same divine providence which called all things into being accompanies and sustains them. The first official dogmatic statement of the Roman Catholic Church regarding providence was given by the Vatican Council, which set forth the doctrine that "God guards and governs by his providence all things that he has created," knowing "those things which shall come to pass by the free acts of creatures."

6. Early Protestantism.

The traditional Roman Catholic teaching on providence was not deliberately revised at the Reformation, and yet this period marked a decisive turning-point in the history of the development of the doctrine. The reason for this was practical, not theoretical. Belief in providence was no longer centered in an explanation of the universe, but in a realization, which must be practically experienced, of the fatherly care and guidance of God. This knowledge is of faith, not reason; and such faith was held by Luther to produce a theodicy by giving a practical solution to the problem of evil which, while not explaining every mystery, raises the Christian above the world by rendering him certain of the existence of a love that overcomes affliction, sin, and death. A similar line of argument was followed by Melanchthon and set forth by him in the Augsburg Confession. The Reformed Church gave to the dogma of predestination the importance which Lutheranism attached to justification by faith, but the very fact that this branch of Protestantism undeniably connected the doctrines of election and providence imperiled the eminently practical character of the Reformed belief in providence. In his treatise on providence Zwingli defines the doctrine as "the eternal and immutable governance and administration of all things," so that the free will of man is absorbed in the divine activity, man becoming merely a tool in the hands of God, and faith being made renunciation of individual merit, the conclusion being that God does all, and man nothing. This determinism really ends in making God the cause of evil and wickedness, but Zwingli did not shrink from this deduction, endeavoring to solve the difficulty by saying that moral standards are applicable to men and not to God. The distinctively Christian side of his teaching appears only in his treatment of election. A very similar position was taken by Calvin, whose "Institutes" give separate treatment to the subject of providence and to eternal election, treating the latter in connection with the specific Christian teaching of salvation. In regard to the former, Calvin holds that all things are governed by divine providence, and that God "so uses the works of the wicked, and so turns their minds to execute his judgments, that he himself remains pure from all stain." His theodicy finds its best expression in his sermons on Job, delivered in 1554: "Since God loves us, we shall never be confounded; and so far are our afflictions from preventing our salvation, that they will be turned to our help, for God will take care that our salvation shall be advanced by them." The same thoughts are repeated by the French Confession (II., VIII., in Schaff, *Creeds*, iii., 360, 364); and the Heidelberg Catechism (Quest. 27, in Schaff, *Creeds*, iii., 316) likewise gives clear expression to this topic, insisting on the certainty of the believer that he is the object of the Father's care, and that no creature is separated from the divine love, God's will conditioning and ruling each and every act.

7. Protestant Scholasticism.

Orthodox Protestant scholasticism later made belief in providence a mere part of natural theology, thus depriving it of its real Christian significance. According to this teaching, belief in providence was an article of mixed faith, that is, it was accessible to man's natural reason, though it could be fully known only from the Bible. Providence was considered to embrace three elements: foreknowledge, purpose, and execution of purpose, the latter forming the transition to providence in its relation to the world. Further distinctions were soon drawn between divine conservation, cooperation, and governance. The first of these implied continual creation; the second, postulating a difference according to the nature of the secondary causes, affirmed that "God cooperates unto effect, not unto defect"; and the third distinguished the modes of divine governance as permission (cf. Ps. lxxxi. 12; Rom. i. 24, 26, 28), hindrance (cf. Gen. xx. 6, xxxi. 24; Num. xxii. 12 sqq.; II Kings xix. 35–36), direction (cf. Gen. l. 20; I Sam. xvi. 1–13), and determination (cf. Isa. x. 12 sqq.). While providence watches over even the smallest, its modes differ. Creation as a whole is the object of general, or universal, providence; all mankind, whether good or bad, are watched by special providence; but the pious and faithful are under the care of "most special providence." Providence was also divided into ordinary and extraordinary, the former being that which is almost universally accomplished by natural mediate causes, and the latter that which operates through the agency of miracles. This complicated scholasticism long remained common to both the Lutheran and the Reformed Churches.

8. Pietistic and Modern Views.

During this long period of stereotyped dogmatism the real expression of the Protestant belief in providence must be sought especially in devotional literature and hymnology, which represent communion with God through Christ as the real source of a knowledge of God's providence. During the course of the Pietistic movement, the foundation of the orphan asylum at Halle was the occasion of a dispute over the nature of divine providence. Francke considered this establishment, with the remarkable answers to prayer and the cases of individual salvation connected with it, as a monument of most particular providence. His opponents sought to reduce the whole matter to the level of pure natural happenings, contending that the introduction of human means excluded the op-

eration of divine providence. Rationalism gave a high place to belief in providence as an essential part of natural theology Lessing, accordingly, in his *Ueber die Erziehung des Menschengeschlechts,* represents God as a teacher who instructs his pupils to help themselves, not as a deity who directly governs the world. So far as theodicy was concerned, Leibnitz took the most prominent position, with his *Essai de théodicée* (Amsterdam, 1710). The actual existence of evil, he contended, does not disprove that the world was created by an all-good and an all-powerful activity. Physical evil is a necessary consequence of moral evil; it is the natural punishment of sin. Moral evil is to be traced back to the limitation and to the finiteness of what is created; this is metaphysical evil. Since, however, the conception of creation involves finiteness, a world of perfect creatures would be a contradiction; a world without evil would be unthinkable. At the same time, the world is contingent and represents a choice of many possibilities; and since God has exercised this choice, the world is proved to be the best of all possible worlds. This optimism was severely shaken by the Lisbon earthquake of 1755, which was discussed in Voltaire's *Candide* with a characteristic union of irony, frivolity, and keenness, the result being pessimistic skepticism. A sharp contrast to this attitude is to be found in Kant, who recognized the value of the physico-theological proof, though he no more regarded it as a complete demonstration than he did the cosmological and ontological arguments. The attitude of more recent theologians and philosophers toward providence is naturally conditioned by their general, deistic, pantheistic, or theistic points of view. Among them special mention should be made of Schleiermacher, who held the relation between God and the world to be represented in the feeling of dependence, though he denied that the interests of piety required any fact so to be conceived that its dependence on God removed it from the sphere of the operations of nature, since both the mechanism of nature and human consciousness are alike ordered by God. The results of these premises Schleiermacher developed in his treatment of miracles and in his conception of evil. Strauss represents the standpoint of Hegelian speculation, affirming that the cosmic powers and their relations testify to an immanent reason. Pantheistic tendencies, as represented by Spinoza or Hegel, were sharply opposed by Ritschl, who returned to the Reformers' standpoint, and found the basis of the belief of the religious governance of the world in the atonement.

9. Critical Conclusion.

The Christian teaching of divine providence must rest essentially on the form it takes in the Gospel; what stands there must be brought to full expression. The certainty of Christian belief must be purified of all those elements which in themselves have only a dogmatic interest, since, if they are not properly discussed, they endanger the Christian assurance of salvation. It is clear that the Bible does not bring divine providence into the sphere of theoretically scientific explanation of God and the world. The problem belongs in the forum of the subjective, practical, and teleological religious consideration of faith. The interest of early Protestant teaching on the subject lies in its practical break with the intellectualism of scholastic philosophy, and in its insistence on the personal and ethical nature of belief in providence. Though for a time there was a return to pre-Reformation concepts, there is a general tendency among modern German Protestant theologians to reject these intellectualistic tendencies and to find the most fruitful results in carrying out the lines of thought initiated by Luther. To the quasi-scholastic distinctions of early Protestantism many objections may be alleged. Suffice it to say that the delimitations are unsatisfactory because of confusion in the categories to which they are assigned, errors in distinction of nature and character, artificiality in the classes postulated, and lack of sharpness of definition. Notwithstanding, moreover, the numerous attempts to derive the concept of providence from empirical views of the world, and to develop a so-called physico-theological proof of God's existence, it is clear that empiricism leads to polytheism or to dualism rather than to ethical monotheism. The conviction of divine providence is not built up through the teaching of retribution or thoughts of merit; but rests on the facts of moral consciousness, and on the practical recognition of the kingdom of God revealed by Jesus Christ, in which God's grace overcomes and heals man's moral and natural necessities. The atonement brings the conviction of the inexhaustible love of God for his children, the assurance that "all things work together for good to them that love God" (Rom. viii. 28). This is not a theoretical definition of a principle, but a practical solution to be applied by life itself. The Christian is convinced that all the elements of life's experiences, however contradictory they may seem, are but factors in the construction of the supernatural divine kingdom. This belief shows itself religiously in the recognition of the universal activity of divine love, in the practise of prayer, and in the certainty that it will be heard by God; and it is manifested ethically in the fulfilment of the duties arising from man's practical position in the world.

10. Subsidiary Problems.

Although this type of practical conviction is not capable of theoretical proof, and does not require such demonstration, nevertheless individual problems arise which can be solved only by constructing a Christian philosophy of nature and history, i.e., the explanation of all development in both fields as the means to God's eternal end. Such questions, therefore, as the relation of providence to Miracles and Prayer (qq.v.), to the freedom of man (see WILL, FREEDOM OF THE), and to the actuality of evil and Sin (q.v.) must be mentioned briefly. The world as depicted by natural science is a construction of man's mind. Natural laws are, therefore, merely conceptual and subjective, not objective and real; they are only necessary psychological and logical formulas to enable man to arrange his knowledge of phenomenal reality; and they can claim no such metaphysical importance as though they represented the whole of reality or all the possibilities of existence. If this fact be

granted, the metaphysical possibility of miracles can not be denied. This is not, however, sufficient for the Christian, who must also be convinced that the whole mechanism of nature serves a divine end. This belief that in every individual instance the world and nature act as the agents of a divine, omnipotent, loving will is immediately connected with the assurance that such prayer as prescribes no laws to the grace of God, but only gives the human conditions for divine activity, will certainly be heard. In considering the relation of providence to the freedom of the will it is always possible, even though divine and human spheres of action are essentially incommensurable, to bring the acts of a created being within the scope of divine action, this being the point of view of faith. To the religious mind man's freedom will always be thought of as freedom in God; the Christian experiences as reality what science can neither attain, prove, nor refute. The stronger the consciousness of his freedom, the greater the conviction of his dependence on God. Even sin, though never caused by God, may, when once committed, become part of the divine plan and serve providence in the advancement of the kingdom of God. A similar method must be applied to the problem of theodicy. The riddle of the world's evil is not solved by theoretical explanations. In his difficulties the Christian is saved from unrest and despair only by the revelation of the atonement and by the conviction that evil and distress are, in God's hands, made the means of his eternal salvation. This solution is open to the humblest Christian and rests on practical experiences, even though such experiences must be differentiated from those intellectual speculations which are bound to arise. Even the religious mind must face the fact that there are questions and problems, and must seek for ways and means which may yield approximate solutions for such riddles.

P Lobstein.

While the basis of belief in providence is the love of God as revealed in his gracious purpose, modern thought is not content with so simple and unrelated a position. The scholastic, formalistic, logical splitting-up of the doctrine is indeed no longer of interest, but other problems aside from those mentioned in the last two sections preceding are demanding attention and solution. Metaphysics, speculative theism, and even scientific views of nature may be driven out with a fork, but their return is legitimate and inevitable. Two further questions profoundly affecting the doctrine of providence will then require consideration: (1) The idea of the divine immanence: the traditional doctrine of providence has been derived from the postulate of transcendence. Now, however, the notion of the immanence of God has compelled two modifications of view, which are of serious import to the subject under discussion. One concerns providence as related to creation. Creation is conceived not as the absolute origination of the existing material of the world out of nothing at a metaphysical moment, but as the eternal becoming or change of manifestation of the Absolute Ground of all. Creation and providence are therefore two ways of conceiving of the world, as related either to its causal Ground or to its purposive ends. The other modification discloses God as more inwardly and actively involved in the processes of the world, both physical and psychical, accordingly more responsible for the working-out of the ideal aim of the universe than any but the more pantheistic views have hitherto maintained (yet cf. Rom. xi. 36; I Cor. xv. 24–28). (2) The evolutionary view of the world: broadly speaking, this is the universal method of providence. This involves teleology, effectiveness of divine action and control, and ends which are correlated with and consummated in the ideals of personality. With reference to man the sphere of providence is, on the one hand, the world in process of evolution, and, on the other, the development of human historical life. Of particular significance in this latter region are the principle of social unity, the influence of great personalities, and the redemptive power of suffering and sacrifice.

C. A. Beckwith.

II. Supplement.

Bibliography: For the views of classical authors on the subject, besides the works of Zeller, Windelband, Ueberweg, Erdmann, and Weber on the history of philosophy, consult: Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, I., iv., IV., 3; Cicero, *De natura deorum*, book 2; idem, *De finibus*, book 3; Seneca, *De providentia*, R. Schneider, *Christliche Klänge aus den griechischen und römischen Klassikern*, pp. 231–244, Gotha, 1865; E. Spiess, *Logos spermatikos*, Leipsic, 1871; L. Schmidt, *Die Ethik der alten Griechen*, i. 63 sqq., Berlin, 1881; E. Maillet, *La Création et la providence devant la science moderne*, pp. 195–235, Paris, 1897.

On the idea in Hebrew, Jewish, and apostolic circles consult: the works in and under Biblical Theology; H. Zschokke, *Theologie der Propheten des A. T.*, pp. 141 sqq., Freiburg, 1877; C. G. Chavannes, *La Religion dans le Bible*, 2 vols., Paris, 1889; G. Fulliquet, *La Pensée religieuse dans le N. T.*, Paris, 1893; J. Bovan, *Étude sur l'œuvre de la redemption*, vols. i.–ii., Paris, 1893–94; K. Marti, *Geschichte der israelitischen Religion*, Strasburg, 1897; E. Sellin, *Beiträge zur israelitischen und jüdischen Religionsgeschichte*, Leipsic, 1897; W. Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*, Berlin, 1903; B. Stade, *Biblische Theologie des A. T.*, Tübingen, 1905.

For the history of the development of the subject the reader is referred to the works named in and under Doctrine, History of: also R. Seeberg, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, Leipsic, 1895–98; F. Loofs, *Grundriss der Dogmengeschichte*, 4th ed., Halle, 1907. For the Reformers note Luther's Catechisms on the first article of the Apostles' Creed and Zwingli's *De providentia*, 1529.

For the dogmatic treatment it is to be noted that as a rubric under systematic theology the subject necessarily finds discussion in works on dogmatics (see for titles Dogma, Dogmatics), which usually furnish also lists of works bearing on the topics. Consult further: S. Charnock, *A Treatise of Divine Providence, General and Particular*, London, 1683; G. W. Leibnitz, *Essais de theodicée*, 2 vols., Amsterdam, 1710; J. B. Bossuet, *Traité de la connaissance de dieu et de soi-même*, Paris, 1722; J. Flavel, *Divine Conduct; or, the Mystery of Providence*, reprint, Philadelphia, 1840; O. Dewey, *The Problem of Human Destiny; or, the End of Providence in the World and Man*, New York, 5th ed., 1866; H. Wallace, *Representative Responsibility, a Law of the Divine Procedure in Providence and Redemption*, Edinburgh, 1867; M. J. Scherben, *Handbuch der katholischen Dogmatik*, i. 657–664, Freiburg, 1873 (Roman Catholic); R. A. Lipsius, *Die göttliche Weltregierung*, Frankfort, 1878; G. Kreibig, *Die Rätsel der göttlichen Vorsehung*, Berlin, 1886; J. de Maistre, *Les Soirées de St. Petersburg, ou entretiens sur le gouvernement temporel de la Providence*, 2 vols., new ed., Paris, 1886; W Schmidt, *Die göttliche Vorsehung und das Selbstleben der Welt*, Berlin, 1887; idem, *Der Kampf der Weltanschauungen*, ib. 1904; W Beyschlag, *Zur Verständigung über den christlichen Vorsehungsglauben*, Halle, 1888; J. B. Heinrich, *Dogmatische Theologie*, v. 313–368, Mainz, 1888

(Roman Catholic); C. Pesch, *Prælectiones dogmaticæ*, ii. 166–173, Freiburg, 1899 (Roman Catholic); O. Kirn, *Vorsehungsglaube und Naturwissenschaft*, Berlin, 1903; R. Otto, *Naturalistische und religiöse Weltanschauung*, Tübingen, 1904, Eng. transl., *Naturalism and Religion*, New York, 1907; A. Titius, *Religion und Naturwissenschaft*, Tübingen, 1904; *KL*, xii. 1097–1113; W. Lerch, *Bedenken gegen die göttliche Vorsehung*, Warnsdorf, 1906.

In connection with § 11 consult especially J. Le Conte, *Evolution and its Relation to Religious Thought*, part iii., 2d ed., New York, 1894; A. C. Fraser, *Philosophy of Theism, Gifford Lectures*, 2 ser., pp. 82 sqq., London, 1896; A. B. Bruce, *The Providential Order of the World*, New York, 1897; idem, *The Moral Order of the World*, ib. 1899.

PROVINCIAL (*provincialis superior*): The regular ecclesiastic who presides over a number of cloisters which collectively form a province. The monks constitute a peculiar hierarchy, which, while not in all points alike in the various orders, essentially conforms to the following gradation. Within any given district the cloisters of an order constitute a department, which among the Franciscans is termed *custodia*. Several of these compose a province, in charge of a provincial; whereas the entire order is under the general. The province may embrace one or several countries, according to circumstances. Notwithstanding the obedience commanded by the hierarchical organization of the cloister system, the superior's authority is limited through the necessity of conference with ecclesiastics of the order when important objects are under advisement. Thus the prior of the separate cloister is offset by the fathers of the same; the superior of the province by the superiors of the separate cloisters; the general of the order by the provincials. The provincials, who at the same time are superiors of some chief cloister of their province, appear in still other connections as members of the chapter general of an entire order.

E. Sehling.

PROVISOR: A person appointed as administrator of part of the church property. Originally, church property was administered by the bishop. As the wealth of the Church came to be specialized, the administration of the parochial property devolved upon the parish priest under supervision of bishop and archdeacon. Very soon, however, there also grew up an influence on the side of the secular parishioners, and suitable persons from their midst were either elected by the parochians, or appointed by the church dignitaries, as administrators of the church structure. They bore various designations, among others *vitrici* and *provisores*. As clergy were termed "fathers" of the Church (*patres ecclesiæ*), so the *provisores* were termed "patronal" fathers.

The designation *provisor* is applied also to the auxiliary clergy, specifically to parish incumbents.

E. Sehling.

PROVOST, SAMUEL: First Protestant Episcopal bishop of New York; b. in New York City Mar. 11, 1742; d. there Sept. 6, 1815. He received his education at King's College (now Columbia University), graduating in 1761, and at the University of Cambridge, England, entering St. Peter's House (now St. Peter's College); he was made deacon and priest in London, 1766; and on his return to America became one of the clergy of Trinity Church, New York, where he became noted for his patriotism and received the title of "the patriot rector" after his selection to the rectorship in 1784. His service with Trinity was not continuous, however, as in 1774 political conditions led him to retire to a small estate in what was then Dutchess county. Here he indulged his love of botany (at Cambridge he prepared a manuscript index to Baubin's *Historia planetarum*) as a disciple of Linnæus. In 1786 he was elected bishop of New York, and was consecrated at Lambeth Palace. He offered his resignation of the bishopric in 1801, but it was declined and he was given a bishop-coadjutor. He published nothing, but was a scholar of notable attainments, being proficient in not only the classical languages, but in French, German, and Italian, translating but not publishing Tassot's "Jerusalem Delivered." He did excellent service for his church during a period when episcopacy was not popular in this country.

Bibliography: W E. Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, v. 240–246, New York, 1859; J. G. Wilson and others, *Centennial Hist. of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of New York, 1785–1885*, ib., 1886; W S. Perry, *The Episcopate in America*, p. 9, ib., 1895; M. Dix, *Hist. of the Parish of Trinity Church*, vol. ii., ib., 1901.

PROVOST (PRÆPOSITUS): In general, a presiding officer, whether temporal or spiritual; as a special term it was applied to a monastic official subordinate to the prior. According to the Benedictine rule, the provost ranks immediately after the abbot; later a dean was also appointed, coordinate with the provost. In the nunneries a præposita or priorissa followed in rank the abbess. At the cathedral church, the archdeacon became cathedral provost; in the chapters of the churches, he kept the simpler designation of provost. Thenceforth provost and dean occupied the two uppermost positions in the chapters, ranking as prelates (see Prelate). Their position varied in the different foundations according to the appertaining statutes. Inasmuch as the administration of *temporalia* frequently interfered with the provost's actual residence and prevented him from giving his attention to other business of the chapter, he sometimes withdrew from the chapter altogether, and was replaced by the dean as capitulary chief.

In later times provosts were largely retained as priors of cloisters, as among the Augustinians, Dominicans ("provost or prior"), and Cistercians ("provost or guardian"). As distinguished from these provosts of the regular clergy, there were temporal provosts of cloisters, whose business it was to administer the property as stewards or to serve as their protectors. The term occasionally denotes other custodians who hold membership offices in the church councils of particular congregations. The chief of the army chaplains, or military clergy, is sometimes called "field provost," "principal chaplain."

The title also passed over to the Evangelical church, and is sometimes borne by superintendents, as under the Swedish occupancy of Pomerania, and in Mecklenburg. In foundations retained from the medieval Church, the provost's office continued active, as at the cathedral foundation in Naum-

burg and in Berlin. Cloister provosts are not unknown to the Evangelical church, where the name denotes certain officials entrusted with supervision over the property of Evangelical sisterhood foundations. E. SEHLING.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Bingham, *Origines*, II., ii. 4–5, xix. 14, III., xii.; F. J. Meyer, *De dignitatibus in capitulis*, 4, § xiii., Göttingen, 1782; A. J. Binterim, *Denkwürdigkeiten*, iii. 2, pp. 361–362, Mainz, 1826.

PRUDENTIUS, AURELIUS CLEMENS: Christian poet; b. in the province of Tarragona, Spain, 348; d. after 403. He came of a distinguished Christian family and received an excellent education, studied law, became an office-holder and rose rapidly, was twice governor of a province, and finally received high office at the court of Theodosius. When past middle life, he came to view his course of life as little worthy and withdrew from public life to devote himself to poetry in the service of religion and the Church. His earliest poems are the twelve hymns contained in the *Cathēmerinon* (for use in the morning, at meals, and at night, from which the collection took its name). The model of Prudentius in poetry was Ambrose, though there is a distinct independent development. He employs the events of the times, and is not restricted to the forms of verse used by Ambrose. While his verse is popular, the lyrical element often recedes in consequence of the introduction of the didactic and epic admixture. A second collection, the *Peristephanon*, shows still greater originality and variety of verse form. This celebrates Spanish and Roman martyrs, and may have been influenced by the inscriptions of Damasus (see DAMASUS I.) which celebrated the martyrs. The epic and dramatic elements here are quite pronounced. There are extant also two didactic-polemic poems: *Apotheosis*, in 1,408 hexameters, exalts the deity of Christ against Patripassians, Sabellians, Jews, and Eremites; *Hamartigenia*, in 966 hexameters, deals with the origin of evil in a polemic against Marcion's gnostic dualism. Both of these lean on Tertullian. He also left a purely polemic work in two books (657 and 1,132 hexameters) called *Contra Symmachum*, in which he combats the heathen state religion. It is under the influence of Ambrose's epistle against Symmachus. All three of these last-named contained passages of beauty, but the *Hamartigenia* is the noblest. A fourth work, of slight esthetic interest, but important from a literary-historical point of view (915 hexameters), is the *Psychomachia*, the first example in the West of allegorical poetry, setting forth the conflict of Christian virtues with heathen vices. It comes out of the times of the author and portrays the life of those times, and had a great influence during the Middle Ages. Finally, there is extant a collection of forty-nine quatrains in hexameter with the title *Dittochæon*, which sets forth a Biblical picture in each quatrain. It has been supposed that these explain decorations in the basilica attended by the author, twenty-four Old-Testament pictures on one side, twenty-four from the New Testament on the other, and one in the apse. (G. KRÜGER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Owing to the fact that the poems of Prudentius were great favorites in Germany and were even used as a text-book, a large number of excellent MSS. are extant (cf. the work of Stettiner below) and a prodigious number of German glosses. The number of editions is large. The noteworthy editions are: M. Heinsius, Amsterdam, 1667; F. Arevalo, 2 vols., Rome, 1788–89, reproduced with prolegomena, *MPL*, lix.–lx.; T. Obbar, Tübingen, 1845; and A. Dressel, Leipsic, 1860. In English may be noted the *Cathemerinon*, London, 1845; also a transl. of the Hymns, by G. Morison, 3 parts, Cambridge, 1889; by R. Martin Pope, London, 1905; *Translations from Prudentius: a Selection*, by F. St. J. Thackeray (in verse), London, 1890; *Songs (Selected and Translated)*, by E. Giliat-Smith, London, 1898. Consult: A. Ebert, *Geschichte der Litteratur des Mittelalters*, i. 251–293, Leipsic, 1880 (indispensable); L. Paul, *Étude sur Prudence*, Strasburg, 1862; P Gams, *Kirchengeschichte Spaniens*, ii. 1, pp. 337–358, Regensburg, 1864; C. Brockhaus, *Aurelius Prudentius Clemens in seiner Bedeutung für die Kirche und seine Zeit*, Leipsic, 1872; P. Allard, in *Revue des questions historiques*, xxv (1884), 345–385, xxxvi (1884), 5–61, xxxvii (1885), 353–405; A. Rosler, *Der katholische Dichter Aurelius Prudentius Clemens*, Freiburg, 1886 (detailed; has eye to church and doctrinal history); P. A. J. Puech, *Prudence; étude sur la poesié latine chrétienne au 4. siècle*, Paris, 1888 (elaborate); M. Manitius, *Geschichte der christlich-lateinischen Poesie*, pp. 61–99, Stuttgart, 1891; C. Weymann, in *Commentationes Woelfflinianæ*, pp. 281–287, Leipsic, 1891; G. Boissier, in *RDM*, xci (1889), 357–390; idem, *La Fin du paganisme*, pp. 106–151, Paris, 1894; A. Baumgartner, *Geschichte der Weltlitteratur*, iv. 152 sqq., Freiburg, 1900; T. R. Glover, *Life and Letters in the Fourth Century*, pp. 249–277, Cambridge, 1901; O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur*, ii. 396, 503, 635, 640, Freiburg, 1903; F. Maigret, *Le Poète chrétien Prudence*, Paris, 1903; E. O. Winstedt, in *Classical Review*, xvii (1903), 203–207; M. Schanz, *Geschichte der römischen Litteratur*, iv. 211–235, Munich, 1904 (has full list of references); R. Stettiner, *Die illustrierten Prudentius-Handschriften*, Berlin, 1905 (sumptuous); *DCB*, iv. 500–505. Richardson, *Encyclopaedia*, p. 889, furnishes references to some excellent periodical literature.

PRUDENTIUS OF TROYES: Bishop of Troyes from shortly before 847; d. Apr. 6, 861. He was a Spaniard named Galindo, and was educated at the Frankish court-school. In 849 he wrote to Hincmar of Reims and Pardulus of Laon championing Augustinianism in the predestination controversy of the time (see GOTTSCHALK, 1; HINCMAR OF REIMS). God predestinated the wicked not so much to sinning—Adam's fall was entirely free—as to well-merited punishment; the elect alone are redeemed by Christ's death from the *massa perditionis* (*MPL*, cxv. 975–976). Nevertheless Prudentius seems to have signed the theses of Hincmar at Quierzy in 853, but in the same year (or in 856) he attacked them in four theses which he presented to a synod at Paris (*MPL*, cxv. 1365 sqq.). He remained Hincmar's bitter opponent, although he wrote no more in the controversy. His part in the *Annales Bertiniani*, for which he wrote the years 835–861, is his chief service to history. (R. SCHMID.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The *Annales Bertiniani* of Prudentius are best in *MGH, Script.*, i (1826), 429–454, then in *MPL*, cxv. 1377–1420, cxxv. 1203–1302; also ed. C. Dehaisnes, Paris, 1871, and G. Waitz, Hanover, 1883; the poems are in *MGH, Poet. Lat. med. ævi*, i (1884), 679–680. There is a Germ. transl., new ed. by W. Wattenbach, Leipsic, 1890, and Fr. transl. in Guizot, *Collection des mémoires*, vol. iv., Paris, 1824. Consult: J. Lebeuf, *Dissertations sur l'hist. . . de Paris*, i. 432-497, Paris, 1739; J. C. F. Bähr, *Geschicte der römischen Literatur im karolingischen Zeitalter*, pp. 167, 453–456, Carlsruhe, 1840; J. C. Pritchard, *Life and Times of Hincmar*, Littlemore, 1849; J. Girgensohn, *Prudentius und die bertinianischen Annalen*, Riga, 1875; E. Dümmler, in *NA*, iv (1879), 314; A. Ebert, *Geschichte der Literatur des Mittelalters*, ii. 267, 365–368, Leipsic, 1880; Wattenbach, *DGQ*, i (1885), 196, 263, 277, i (1893), 214-294, 295; idem, in *NA*, xvi (1891), 607–609.

PRUSSIA.

I. Introduction of Christianity.
The Prussian People; First Missionary Efforts (§ 1).
Order of Teutonic Knights (§ 2).
II. Statistics.
Gain and Loss (§ 1).
Ecclesiastical Facilities (§ 2).
Auxiliary Support (§ 3).
III. Ecclesiastical Organization.
Evangelical.
State Church Government (§ 1).
Congregational and Synodal Constitution (§ 2).
2. Roman Catholic.

I. Introduction of Christianity: The people which in history is called Prussian is the population that in the migration of nations settled in that part of the Baltic coast-land which in the second half of the Middle Ages was known as Prussia. Their name *Pruzi*, or, in its lengthened form, *Prutheni* (their country, *Prucia* or *Prussia*), is derived from the Lithuanian *Protas*, i.e., insight, understanding: they called themselves *Pruzi*, the sagacious. The character of these people can hardly be established to-day, since they were extinct by the end of the seventeenth century. Their language has been preserved in two translations of the Lutheran catechism, the so-called Old Prussian catechism, Königsberg, 1545, 1561. From these linguistic fragments it is evident that the early Prussians were neither Germans nor Slavs, but belonged with their neighbors, among whom were the Lithuanians, to that special branch of the Indo-Germanic group which is called Lettish. As to the south of them the Poles had settled and to the west the Wends, they had no contact with Germany. Their religion was nature worship, a naive polytheism, deifying sun, moon, stars, thunder, birds, and quadrupeds. The common center of sacrifice was Romove, a place near Domnau (23 m. s.e. of Königsberg, East Prussia); the place of worship was under trees, especially the oak. The people believed in a future life and retribution of a material kind. They dwelt in free, independent communities without national feeling. Their pursuits were agriculture and cattle-raising, trade and the chase. They practised polygamy, while women were treated as merchandise and slaves. The sick were exposed or slain, and drunkenness was a common vice. Hospitality, however, stood in high esteem. Because of their exclusion toward the south and west, Christianity could not come to the Prussians before the Christianization of the Poles and Wends. The first missionary attempt was made in 997 by Bishop Adalbert of Prague (q.v.), but without success. Bruno, Count of Querfurt, a relative of Otto III., who made a similar attempt, was suddenly captured by the heathen, with eighteen of his companions, and beheaded in 1009. In 1207 Abbot Gottfried from the monastery of Lekno in Greater Poland baptized some people, but was prevented by his early death from organizing congregations. Another monk, named Christian, probably also from a Cistercian monastery in Greater Poland, had better success, owing to the energetic assistance of Duke Conrad of Masovia and Cujavia. Christian entered the so-called territory of Culm from the south, and between 1207 and 1210 preached Christianity in the neighborhood of Löbau (74 m. s.e. of Danzig) and on the boundary line of Pomerania under the authority of Pope Innocent III. Between 1212 and 1215 he became "bishop" in Prussia. Two chiefs, Warpoda and Svabuno, with others were converted and received baptism in Rome. They granted pieces of land to their bishop, in the neighborhood of Löbau, and Duke Conrad of Masovia gave him the larger part of the territory of Culm, which possessions became a secure foundation of the Prussian bishopric.

1. The Prussian People; First Missionary Efforts.

To protect the converted Prussians from the hatred of their countrymen, Pope Honorius III. demanded, in Poland and Pomerania, in 1217, and in Germany, in 1218, the preaching of a crusade against the Prussian heathen. Not until 1223 did the crusading armies from Silesia and Pomerania enter the territory of Culm. At the same time the Prussians fell fiercely upon Pomerania and Masovia. Christian, who had taken refuge in the fortified castle of Culm, and Conrad of Masovia were in the greatest peril and turned to the heroic Order of Teutonic Knights, promising them large grants of land for the conquest of Prussia. Hermann of Salza, the grand-master of the order, who sojourned at that time in Italy at the court of Ferdinand II. of Hohenstauffen, consented, although he was not immediately prepared to send an army; but in 1228 he sent a deputation of his knights to receive the land grant of Culm. In addition Bishop Christian also conferred upon him a tithe from his own possessions at Culm and in 1231 the gift of a third of his lands and its appurtenances. In the mean time Pope Gregory IX., in 1230, renewed the demand for a crusade against the Prussian heathen, and in 1231 Hermann Balke with an army of knights crossed the Vistula at Nassau and advanced toward Pomerania. Wherever the order gained a footing, fortresses were erected and German colonists attracted. Thus arose the towns of Thorn, Culm, Grandenz, Marienwerder (1233), Elbing (1237), and Königsberg (1255). In 1238 the Teutonic order in Prussia united with the Order of the Brethren of the Sword in Livonia so that it could extend its missionary and colonizing activity far into the East. Wherever a town was founded there arose a church. Here and there a church or monastery was erected in the country. During an invasion from Samland, Bishop Christian was taken captive in Pomerania (1232). After his release in 1238 through Christian merchants, he accused the order of having made no efforts at ransom and of having robbed him of his possessions and privileges. The pope sent a legate who decided in favor of the order, conceding to the bishop only one-third of the conquered land and only the spiritual functions in the territory of the order. A reason why Christian did not enjoy any longer the favor of the papal court is to be found in the fear of leaving such a

2. Order of Teutonic Knights.

large territory under the rule of one person. Pope Innocent IV. accordingly divided Prussia, in 1243, into four episcopal dioceses: Culm, Pomerania, Ermland, and Samland; and these four bishopries together with those of the Baltic provinces were put under the authority of the archbishop of Riga. This was entirely after the desire of the Teutonic order; for an archbishop living in Riga could not hinder their plans in Prussia. Moreover, the Teutonic knights established the tradition that the bishopries and cathedral chapters should be occupied by priests from their own order. The treaty of peace between the Prussians and the order, concluded at Christburg in 1249, throws light upon the inner history of the mission. The Prussians promised to renounce heathenism entirely and adopt Christianity; however, a long time passed before the entire country as far as the Lithuanian boundary was subjected. The order was assisted in 1254 by Ottocar II., king of Bohemia, to whom was assigned the castle of Königsberg; and in 1266 by Margrave Otto III. of Brandenburg, who built the fortress of Brandenburg. By 1283 the knights were masters of the country from the Vistula to the Eastern border of modern East Prussia. In 1309 the grand master removed his seat to Marienburg (27 m. s.e. of Danzig), and for about 100 years from that time the order performed a leading part in the events of eastern Europe until the envy and hatred of the Poles broke their power in the terrible battle of Tannenberg (75 m. s.w. of Königsberg) (1410). The territory west of the Vistula was surrendered to the sovereignty of Poland, and that eastward of the river was accepted as a fief. The seat of the order became Königsberg in 1466. The Teutonic order had conquered Prussia in its own interest as a support to the German nobility, became wealthy through trade but the object of hatred, built at the seats of occupation such churches as the cathedral at Königsberg and the Church of St. Mary at Danzig, and allowed the entrance of twenty-four monasteries for men and nine for women; but it did nothing for learning, and did not effect the Christianization of the people. The first to introduce real Christianity was the first Evangelical prince of the duchy of Prussia, Albert of Prussia (q.v.; 1525–1568); but by his time the pitiable remnant of the knights had been almost entirely absorbed by the Germanic colonization. (Paul Tschackert).

II. Statistics: The modern kingdom of Prussia with an area of 134,588 square miles contained, according to the census of Dec., 1905, a population of 37,293,324 (1900, 34,472,509), who are distributed among 88 town districts and 489 country districts. The confessional distribution of the population is shown in the following table:

1. Gain and Loss.

Provinces.	Area, Square Miles.	Evangelicals: Old Lutheran and Old Reformed.	Roman Catholics.	Other Christians.	Jews.	Without Confession.
East Prussia	14,266	1,720,565	278,190	17,781	13,553	87
West Prussia	9,856	764,719	844,566	16,254	16,139	68
Brandenburg	15,377	3,238,207	230,599	21,540	40,427	1,133
Berlin, District of	24	1,695,251	223,948	19,140	98,893	2,916
Pomerania	11,627	1,616,550	50,206	7,829	9,660	81
Posen	11,183	605,312	1,347,958	2,907	30,433	27
Silesia	15,563	2,120,361	2,765,394	9,839	46,845	172
Saxony	9,749	2,730,098	230,860	9,981	8,050	232
Sleswick-Holstein	7,336	1,454,526	41,227	4,834	3,270	391
Hanover	14,865	2,361,831	371,537	10,222	15,581	373
Westphalia	7,801	1,733,413	1,845,263	18,471	20,757	186
Hesse-Nassau	6,060	1,420,047	585,868	13,430	50,016	691
Rhenish Prussia	10,420	1,877,582	4,472,058	30,304	55,408	985
Hohenzollern	441	3,040	64,770	1	469	2
Prussia		23,341,502 (62.59%)	13,352,444 (35.80%)	182,533 (0.49%)	409,501 (1.10%)	7,344 (0.02%)
1908.		21,817,577 63.29%	12,113,670 35.14%	139,127 0.40%	392,322 1.14%	9,813 0.03%

From 1817 to 1900 the percentage of Evangelical population increased steadily, so that finally Protestants and Roman Catholics were almost equally proportioned. From 1900 there is noticeable a retrogression on the Evangelical side, due among other causes to Polish immigration. From change of confession as well as additions and losses the Evangelical church in Prussia had, in 1905, a gain of 6,911 persons against a loss of 3,741. Conversions from the Roman Catholic to the Evangelical church have increased in the last ten years in proportion to the increase of population: in 1895, 3,228; in 1905, 5,939. The loss of the Evangelicals to the Roman Catholics is far smaller: in 1895, 295; in 1905, 441. The Prussian state churches were increased also by the conversion of 346 Jews. The sects, however, and especially the dissidents of the Evangelical church, caused heavy losses. In Berlin and vicinity more than 1,000 people left the Evangelical church in 1905, mostly from anti-Christian motives; in the whole of Prussia there were 3,245 withdrawals, so that the net gain was reduced to 3,170. According to the latest statistics of 1906, 12,007 persons left the State Church as dissidents. It is to be assumed that most of them renounced Church and Christianity through the agitation of the Social Democrats.

The religious needs of the Evangelical population with reference to clergy, church buildings, and funds can not be supplied in equal proportion throughout the country. On Jan. 1, 1905, entire Prussia had 24 general superintendents, 639 superintendents (including the metropolitans), 9,620 clergymen in independent offices, 8,390 parishes, 10,456 spiritual offices, 11,795 churches, and 4,322 other buildings devoted to church service. The province of Saxony, the mother country of the Reformation, is best provided for; as it possesses on the average one clergyman for every 1,600 and one church for every 1,000 Evangelicals. The most unsatisfactory conditions exist in Berlin and in the provinces of East Prussia, West Prussia, Posen, Westphalia, and Rhenish Prussia; in Berlin on account of the densely crowded population for whom there are only few churches and proportionately few clergymen; in the provinces on account of the wide extent of local districts, and because these are frequently merged into one parish, owing to the preponderance of Roman Catholic numbers. To illustrate the inequitable distribution in spite of the progress made, the Church of the Apostle Paul in Schöneberg, Berlin, has seven clergymen to 140,000 in comparison with sundry rural congregations of one clergyman to 300. In the matter of dioceses, some consist of twenty to forty parishes; others of only two to ten. The Prussian Evangelical military clergy stands under the chaplain-general of the army, who is at the same time over the imperial body-guard and chaplain of the navy. Every provincial army-corps and the guard have their superior chaplains, of whom there are in Prussia thirteen, with seventy-six subordinate division and garrison chaplains. Special difficulties regarding the care of congregations in individual localities arise from the fact that the language of the Evangelical population is not everywhere German, the Slavic in its various dialects being the main exception. At the close of 1907 there were in Prussia about 197 Evangelical congregations using the Polish language, East Prussia alone having 123 Polish congregations with 136 clergymen, and 71 congregations in which 88 clergymen preached Lithuanian. The Danish language was used in 113 churches of Sleswick-Holstein. The supply of the churches with clergy has not kept pace with the increase of population. From 1895 the number of candidates for the ministerial office has decreased more than one-half. In the old Prussian state church 523 candidates were examined in 1895; in 1906 only 202: ordained in 1895, 312; in 1906, 242. In 1907 there were only 46 candidates available in East and West Prussia, Pomerania, Posen, Silesia, and Westphalia, in Saxony about 25. In consequence a great many assistant pastorates remain vacant. So far as ascertained for 1907, 38 new parishes with 98 clerical positions were organized to an increase in the Evangelical population of 300,000. The number of theological students decreased from 4,536 in 1900 to 2,228 in the winter semester of 1907–08.

2. Ecclesiastical Facilities.

In the mean time a marked improvement and legal regulation in the remuneration of the clergy and the care of the retired and of the bereft survivors has been made; such as, from 1895, the uniform regulation of a common fund for the widows and orphans of clergymen; from 1899, of an auxiliary salary fund uniformly regulating incomes to the limit of 4,800 marks; and the synodical legislation in 1907–08 for the extension of the latter and the establishment of a retired pension fund for the Evangelical clergy. These measures, it is hoped, will offset the alarming decline in clerical and church facilities. The auxiliary salary fund by the act which went into effect Apr. 1, 1908, regulates salaries up to a benefice of 6,000 marks. Below that all positions are divided into nine classes based upon their ground income and ranging by intervals of 300 marks from class I., 1,800 marks, to class IX., 5,400. Thus, a pastor receives, beside parsonage or equivalent, in class I., 1,800 marks, to which the auxiliary fund adds 600. Moreover, this classification serves also as the scale for increments due to length of service, beginning at the end of the third and proceeding by intervals of three years to the end of the twenty-fourth. The auxiliary fund contributes the excess beyond the ground income and advances additions so that every clergyman is guaranteed from 2,800 marks after the third year of service to 6,000 after the twenty-fourth. Besides, in cases of necessity, additions can also be made, even permanently, to the ground income. By the synodical act of Dec., 1907, the pastor will receive a recompense for removal from charge to charge. The auxiliary fund is instituted by the state churches, and enjoys a legal status. It is administered by a presiding board of five members appointed by the king and an administrative committee of fifty-five members, representatives of the national synods. The parishes have to render, under receipt of the income of the prebendary estate, besides the ground income and various additions to the clerical incumbent, an insurance contribution, graduated according to the class to which they belong, ranging from 1,500 marks in class I. to 300 marks in classes V–IX. In the case of inability, they may receive revocable aid from the reenforcement fund of the consistory (see below). To inaugurate the adequate disbursement of the fund the state budget for 1908–09 assigned 10,000,000 marks. The deficit is covered by the state churches which tax their members on the basis of the state levy. With reference to the retired pension fund, by the act which went into effect Apr. 1, 1908, every clerical who is disqualified by physical disability or the decline of physical or mental powers, or in any case after attaining the age of seventy, is entitled to an annual pension, which is in no case to be less than 1,800 marks nor more than 6,000. This fund, organized like the auxiliary fund, is raised, apart from the contributions for the clergy of societies in Prussia and elsewhere, by an annual state appropriation of 1,600,000 marks, and the levy of the state churches which covers the deficit. In consequence of the legislation of 1889 and 1892 there was founded a special fund for the widows and orphans of deceased clergymen. In 1895 the other state churches joined the fund and it is now

3. Auxiliary Support.

organized in the same way as the other funds. Widows accordingly receive from 700 marks to 1,300 marks; orphans receive to the end of the eighteenth year 400 marks and half-orphans, 250. On the basis of extensive guaranties of the State the Evangelical church in Prussia is now supported by two kinds of taxes: (1) such as every member owes to his parish, district, and province, within the consistorial district; (2) such as benefit his state church in its widest relations, including pension, auxiliary, and widows' funds, and the support of ecclesiastical administration and general objects. Regarding the second, for instance, the state church of the older provinces raises a legally established assessment of $5\frac{1}{4}$ per cent of the state taxes. Beside these revenues the state church of the older provinces raises a not inconsiderable sum by a biennial collection for the most urgent necessities of needy congregations in the Evangelical state churches. Various provincial churches are heavily endowed for general and parish purposes. Besides, there is a state contribution for Evangelical clergymen and churches which in 1907–08 amounted to 2,080,037 marks. The right of appointment in the nine older provinces, for about 3,000 positions, belongs to the state church government, 2,257 of these in alternation with parish organizations, since 1874; for 2,265 positions, it belongs to patrons; for about 700, to communal corporations; for about 1,350, to congregations; and for about 90 to provincial boards other than ecclesiastical. The number of positions filled by the church government and private patrons is by far the largest, but in all cases the congregations possess the right to submit protests against candidates on the grounds of doctrine, conduct, or qualification. In the later provinces, Hanover, Hesse-Nassau, Sleswick-Holstein, the state church authorities control the majority of appointments.

III. Ecclesiastical Organization. 1. Evangelical: The church governing boards culminate in the person of the king, following tradition from the time of the Reformation, on account of, first, an organic connection of Church and State of an ecclesiastico-political nature, guaranteeing the peaceful relations of both; and, secondly, on practical grounds, to provide, within the monarchy, over against the presbyterial form, a stable executive and protection for the Evangelical bodies. At the head of the state church comprising the older Prussian provinces stands the Evangelical supreme church council at Berlin. Including the secular president and spiritual vice-president it consists of thirteen ordinary members, including the chaplain-general. They are appointed for life by the king, at the common proposal of the supreme council and the minister of worship. The duties of the council comprise, among others, consultation with the king in all affairs of legislation and administration reserved for supreme decision; communication with the state central boards on matters of common resort; and the privileges and duties, according to the order of June 29, 1850, of the synodal system, the supervision of worship in relation to dogma and liturgy, of the preparation of candidates for the spiritual office, of the employment, office-bearing, and discipline of clergymen, and the decision in cases arising over elections, grievances, and other legal questions.

1. State Church Government.

At the head of every province there is a consistory under the direction of a secular president and with its seat at the capital of the province. In subordination to the supreme council the consistory is entrusted with the administration of the external and internal affairs of the Church in its province, and the general superintendent is one of the members. The latter keeps the church government in touch with the clergy and congregations, takes part in the synods, introduces the superintendents, conducts the general church visitations, and consecrates new churches. Under the auspices of the consistory acts the commission for the examination of candidates, offering the two tests, for the privilege of preaching and of assuming office. The provinces of the state consistories, with the single exception of the district of Frankfort, are divided into dioceses (*ephorien*) presided over by superintendents, who are state officials. They mediate between the consistories and the congregations and their ministers, exercise immediate personal supervision over the official conduct of clergymen and the life of the congregations, and over candidates residing within their dioceses. A principal part of the work of half of the superintendents of Prussia is the inspection of the district schools.

According to the historical development of the individual state churches of the monarchy, the internal constitution is based upon various legal acts which are valid only for their respective territories. According to that of the Eastern provinces, which may be considered the type of all Prussian church organization, the ministers, who in doctrine, pastoral care, administration of the sacraments, and the other ministerial functions remain independent, are assisted in the congregation by a smaller and a larger representative corporation. Both are elected by the male members above the age of twenty-four who have lived at least one year in the place. All men entitled to election are eligible, in so far as they have proved their interest in the church by participation in the services and sacraments. No one is eligible for the smaller body (elders) who is less than thirty years of age. The elections are valid for six years. The number of elders shall be not more than twelve and not less than four; the number of representatives of the congregation shall be three times as many. The patron may personally claim the office of the elder or have a representative. In very small congregations the meeting of all members entitled to elcction takes the place of the representatives of the congregation or vestry. The minister presides over these bodies. The smaller body ("church council," or presbytery) covers a great variety of duties, religious, disciplinary, administrative, and others pertaining to instruction and charities. The larger body forms a wider outer circle, and, with the church council, exercises mainly material and fiscal functions. Wider self-administration is constituted by the representatives of a whole diocese in a district synod. In their consti-

2. Congregational and Synodal Constitution.

tution there is much variety. In the eastern provinces the district synods consist of the superintendent as the presiding officer, of the entire parish clergy, and of a double number of elected lay members, of which one-half is elected from present or former elders by the representative bodies of the congregations; the other half from respected and experienced men of the synodal district by the representation of the larger congregations, for three years. In Rhenish Prussia and Westphalia, on the other hand, the district synod consists of the clergymen and one elder of every congregation. The district synod has no parliamentary character like the congregational representatives; it is rather the board of the district communion with definite powers of decision. It assembles annually, and its duties comprise the treatment of affairs of general interest, restricted privileges of supervision, and the exercise of church discipline of second instance. The third grade of self-administration of the old Prussian state church is the provincial synod; it consists of the delegates elected from the district synods or unions of synods of small dioceses, of a deputy of the theological faculty of the province, and of the members appointed by the king (not over one-sixth of the entire number). Besides the supervision of discipline in doctrine, worship, and constitution, and the execution of proposals of the state government of the church, the provincial synod has to give its assent to ecclesiastical laws the validity of which is restricted to the province. No catechisms, textbooks, hymnals, manuals, or regular provincial collections can be introduced without its sanction; and it supervises the funds of the district synod, directs the administration of the fund of the provincial synod, decides on the expenditure of church and home collections for the benefit of needy congregations of its district, and is permitted to deputize two or three of its members to the examination commission of the consistory (ut sup.). The presiding head, consisting of a president and from two to six associates, is privileged to take part in the important business affairs of the consistory; and must take a hand with it in proposals for the filling of state church government offices, and in decisions upon objections raised by congregations against the doctrines of their clergymen, and upon all charges of heresy. The general synod is the synodal organ of the entire state church of the nine older provinces. It consists of 150 members elected from the nine provincial synods, of a deputy of the district synod of Hohenzollern, 6 deputies of the theological faculties, all (13) general superintendents, and 30 members to be appointed by the king. The president, vice-president, and six secretaries are elected by the body at the opening of each assembly, to continue until final adjournment. It has primarily the right of assent to all acts of the legislative body of the state church government. Subject to it are the regulation of the freedom of doctrinal teaching, the obligations of clergymen by virtue of their ordination, the norms of agenda for the Church as a whole, the institution and abolition of sacred holidays, changes in the congregational and synodal order, as well as of fundamental changes in the constitution of church government, church discipline with reference to general duties, and disciplinary authority over clergymen and other officers, the requirements for applicants, and fundamental rules on appointment and on matrimony. The second synodal organ of the old Prussian state church is the presiding board of the general synod, consisting of a presiding officer, his proxy, and five associates, for whom also five substitutes are elected. As an independent college it may make proposals for the abolition of defects in ecclesiastical legislation and administration; and it may prepare also drafts of laws for the general synod. In matters which can not be postponed until the convention of the general synod, it may act with the full power of that body. It administers the fund of the general synod and cooperates with the supreme church council in receiving appeals on heresy, in reviewing the proposed acts submitted by the state church government to the general synod for adoption and the instructions of the former to the latter for the execution of its enactments, in proposals for the appointments of the general superintendent, in representation before the courts of justice, and in other affairs of the central administration of the Church, in which it is admitted by the council. As third synodal organ there is elected by the general synod the council of the general synod which is constituted of eighteen members, beside the presiding board of the general synod. It ends its function with the opening of the next regular general synod, and meets once a year in Berlin, to act as advisory counsel to the supreme church council. Outside of the older provinces, the order is in the main similar. The other Evangelical religious communities, the so-called sects, have no great importance in Prussia. Without propaganda and in peaceful relation to the state church are the Mennonites (13,860) and the Unity of the Brethren, distinguished for their institutions of training and missions. The Old Lutherans of Breslau do not relinquish their confessional aloofness; likewise the Dutch Reformed of Elberfeld. Insignificant are the free religious communities organized on the basis of absolute freedom, i.e., indefiniteness. But the propaganda of American and English denominations such as the Irvingites (45,654), Darbyites, Baptists (42,370), Methodists, and the Salvation Army has considerably increased, and has drawn, especially in the larger cities, from the state churches.

2. Roman Catholic: The organization of the Roman Catholic Church in the older provinces is based on the papal bull *De salute animarum* of July 16, 1821, sanctioned as to essential content and published in the code after royal approval, Aug. 23, of that year. The bull defined eight bishoprics: Cologne, Paderborn, Münster, Treves, Breslau, Ermland, Gnesen-Posen, and Culm. There is one ecclesiastical province in the east and one in the west, where the Roman Catholic population is the most dense: respectively, the archbishopric of Gnesen-Posen including the bishopric of Culm; and that of Cologne, including the suffragan bishoprics of Treves, Münster, and Paderborn. Hesse-Cassel is included in the bishopric of Fulda and Wiesbaden in that of Limburg, both under the archbishopric of Freiburg which includes also Hohen-

zollern. The rest of Prussian territory is divided into exempt dioceses which are immediately subject to the pope, namely, Breslau, Berlin, Ermland, Hildesheim, and Osnabrück. The bishops are chosen by the chapters which have advisory privilege in the administration and are appointed, in the old provinces, partly by the king and partly by the bishop, in the new, alternately by bishop and chapter. The choice of a bishop must meet with the king's approval. The Roman Catholic parish organization was legally fixed by statute of June 20, 1875, but this covers only affairs of property; a layman receives no right to participate in the inner administration. This law demands of every parish the organization of a presiding board and a vestry. Over properties and public institutions and over the church-tax system the state has supervision, the same as over the Evangelical bodies. By statute that went into effect Apr. 1, 1899, the state appropriates for the revocable reinforcement of the salaries of priests of weak churches the sum of 3,438,400 marks. In compensation the state has guarded itself by various laws against the ultramontane encroachments of the Roman Catholics; such as that (Dec. 28, 1845) prohibiting appointment to all priests ordained abroad; that (July 4, 1872) prohibiting the Jesuits; that (May 31, 1875) excluding all Roman Catholic orders from Prussian soil; and that (Feb. 13, 1887) establishing the oath of fidelity for Roman Catholic bishops to king and state. A chaplain-general was reinstated in 1888 who has charge of the Roman Catholic chaplains. See also Los von Rom. (E. von der Goltz.)

Bibliography: On the introduction of Christianity consult as sources: *Codex diplomaticus Prussicus*, ed. J. Voigt, vols. i.–vi., Königsberg, 1836–61; *Scriptores rerum Prussicarum*, vols. i.–v., Leipsic, 1861–74; *Preussisches Urkundenbuch, politische Abtheilung*, vol. i., part 1, Königsberg, 1882; *Neues prussische Urkundenbuch*, part II., Danzig, 1885 sqq.; and the literature given in Potthast, *Wegweiser*, pp. xxii.–xxiii. Consult further: A. Schott, *Prussia Christiana*, Danzig, 1738; J. Voigt, *Geschichte Preussens von den ältesten Zeiten bis zur Reformation*, 9 vols., Königsberg, 1827–39; M. Töppen, *Historisch-komparativa Geographie von Preussen*, Gotha, 1858; K. Lohmeyer, *Geschichte von Ost- und Westpreussen*, part 1, Gotha, 1880 (has almost the value of a source book); Hauck, *KD;* Rettberg, *KD;* Friedrich, *KD;* and the literature under Adalbert of Prague.

On modern Prussia as sources consult: E. Friedberg, *Die geltende Verfassungsgesetze der evangel.-deutschen Landeskirchen*, Freiburg, 1885–92; E. Nitze, *Die Verfassungs- und Verwaltungsgesetze der evangel. Landeskirche in Preussen*, Berlin, 1895; H. Lilge, *Gesetze und Verordnungen über die evangel. Kirchenverfassung*, 7th ed., Berlin, 1905; Crisolli and M. Schultz, *Verwaltungsordnung für das kirchliche Vermögen*, Berlin, 1904; the works on ecclesiastical law (*Kirchenrecht*) by H. F. Jacobson, Halle, 1866; P. Hinschius, Berlin, 1869–97; A. L. Richter, 8th ed., Leipsic, 1886; F. H. Vernig, Freiburg, 1893; W. Kahl, Freiburg, 1894; R. Kohler, Berlin, 1895; Gossner, Berlin, 1899; A. Franz, Göttingen, 1899; F. Heiner, Paderborn, 1901; E. Friedberg, 5th ed., Leipsic, 1903; and P. Schoen, Berlin, 1903–06; and the *Gesetzsammlung für die königlichen preussischen Staaten*, an annual published by the Staatsministerium.

The freshest statistical data are to be found for the Protestants in *Kirchliches Jahrbuch*, ed. J. Schneider (an annual); for the Roman Catholics in H. A. Krose, *Kirchliches Handbuch* (also annual); and the fullest historical statement for recent times is in F. Nippold, *Handbuch der neuesten Kirchengeschichte*, 5 vols., Berlin, 1901. On the Protestant church consult: A. Mücke, *Der Friede zwischen Staat und Kirche*, 2 vols., Brandenburg, 1882–88; H. F. Uhden, *Die Lage der lutherischen Kirche in Deutschland*, Hanover, 1883; S. Baring-Gould, *The Church in Germany*, London, 1891; K. Rieker, *Die rechtliche Stellung der evangel. Kirche Deutschlands in ihrer geschichtlichen Stellung bis zur Gegenwart*, Leipsic, 1893; R. Rocholl, *Geschichte der evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland*, Leipsic, 1897; G. Goyau, *L'Allemagne religieuse. Le Protestantisme*, Paris, 1898; P. Schoen, *Das Landeskirchentum in Preussen*, Berlin, 1898; G. H. Schodde, *The Protestant Church in Germany*, Philadelphia, 1901; T. Braun, *Zur Frage der engeren Vereinigung der deutschen evangel. Landeskirchen*, Berlin, 1902; J. Niedner, *Grundzüge der Verwaltungsorganization der altpreussischen Kirche*, ib. 1902; idem, *Die Ausgaben des preussischen Staates für die evangelische Landeskirche der älteren Provinzen*, Stuttgart, 1904; R. Seeberg, *Die Kirche Deutschlands im 19. Jahrhundert*, Leipsic, 1903; T. Hoffmann, *Die Einführung der Union in Preussen und Separation der Altlutheraner*, ib. 1903; H. A. Krose, *Confessionsstatistik Deutschlands*, Freiburg, 1904; E. Kalb, *Kirchen und Sekten der Gegenwart*, Stuttgart, 1905; E. Förster, *Die Entstehung der preussischen Landeskirche unter der Regierung König Friedrich Wilhelms III.*, 2 vols., Tübingen, 1907; M. Bär, *Westpreussen unter Friedrich dem Grossen*, vols. i.–ii., Leipsic, 1909.

On the Roman Catholic Church consult: H. Brück, *Geschichte der katholischen Kirche in Deutschland*, Mainz, 1896–1903; K. Sell, *Die Entwickelung der katholischen Kirche im 19. Jahrhundert*, Leipsic, 1898; *Die katholischen Kirche unserer Zeit und ihrer Diener in Wort und Bild*, 2 vols., Munich, 1900; J. May, *Geschichte der Generalversammlungen der Katholiken Deutschlands 1848–1902*, Cologne, 1903; O. Hegemann, *Friedrich der Grosse und die katholische Kirche in den reichsrechtlichen Territorien Preussens*, Munich, 1904; P. Goyau, *Catholicisme, 1800–1848*, 2 vols., Paris, 1905.

PRUSSIA, REFORMATION IN. See Albert of Prussia.

PRUYSTINCK, LOY. See Loists.

PRYCE, ROBERT VAUGHAN: English Congregationalist; b. at Bristol Dec. 15, 1834. He was educated at New College, London (B.A., University of London, 1859; M.A., 1861), and held pastorates at Union Street, Brighton (1862–71), Worcester (1871–77), and Stamford Hill, London (1877–1889). Since 1889 he has been principal and professor of theology in New College, London, and was lecturer in logic and mental and moral science in Cheshunt College, Herts, from 1887 to 1895. He was also a member of the faculty of theology in the University of London and of the senate of the same institution. In theological position he is in general accord with his denomination.

PRYNNE, WILLIAM: Puritan; b. at Swanswick (10 m. e. of Bristol, Somersetshire) in 1600; d. at London Oct. 24, 1669. He was graduated at Oxford University, 1621; studied law; acquired great notoriety by his learned but dull work *Histriomastix* (London, 1633), against plays, masks, dancing, and the like. For the alleged seditious writing in it he was tried in the Star Chamber (Feb. 7, 1633), and condemned to the loss of his ears, perpetual imprisonment, and to pay a fine of 5,000 pounds. The instigation to this infamous sentence came from Archbishop Laud, whose animosity he had won by writing against Arminianism and the jurisdiction of the bishops. The same court condemned him (June 30, 1637) to branding, and imprisonment in remoter prisons, and another payment of 5,000 pounds, for a fresh seditious and libellous work, *News from Ipswich* (1639). He was

released by the Long Parliament, and received in London (Nov. 28, 1640) with a great ovation. Prynne, by a strange turn of affairs, was solicitor in the trial of Laud (1644), and arranged the whole proceedings. He was a stout opponent of the army in the civil war. In 1648 he was elected to parliament from Newport, and, Dec. 4, 1648, there advocated the cause of Charles. He was expelled in 1650 from the House of Commons for his vehement opposition to Cromwell, but readmitted 1659. He promoted the Restoration, and was rewarded with the appointment of keeper of the records in the Tower (1660); and his collection of records is considered a model work. His learning was very great, and he published about 200 books and pamphlets, mostly controversial (the list of his works in the *British Museum Catalogue* covers twelve pages).

Bibliography: A. à Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses*, ed. P. Bliss, iii. 844, 4 vols., London, 1813–20; *DNB*, xlvi. 432–437; *Encyclopædia Britannica*, sub voce; R. E. M. Peach, *Annals of the Parish of Swainswick*, London, 1890; W. H. Hutton, *The English Church (1625–1714)*, pp. 68–69, 78, 176, London, 1903.

PSALMANAZAR, GEORGE: Literary impostor; b. 1679? d. in London May 3, 1763. The above name was assumed, and he pretended to be a Formosan, though he was really a native of the south of France. He came from Flanders to London as an ostensible convert to Christianity. He was kindly received, and had astonishing success in imposing upon the learned; for he not only compiled and invented a description of the Island of Formosa (London, 1704), but actually a language for the country, into which he translated the Church Catechism, by request of Bishop Compton, whose protégé he was. His fraud was, however, discovered at Oxford, and for the rest of his life he supported himself by writing for booksellers. As the pretended Formosan, he played the part of a heathen; but from his thirty-second year he was in all his actions a genuine Christian, and won the highest respect of his contemporaries.

Bibliography: Consult his own *Memoirs of . . , commonly known by the Name of George Psalmanazar*, London, 1764; J. Boswell, *Life of Samuel Johnson*, ed. G. B. Hill, iii. 314, 443–449, iv. 274, 6 vols., Oxford, 1887; *DNB*, xlvi. 439–442.

PSALM MELODIES, FRENCH: A category of French Protestant religious music composed for the singing of the Psalms, and thus going back ultimately to Calvin, who, in his turn, was profoundly impressed by hearing the Psalms sung in German during his visit to Strasburg in 1538. With them as models he composed the first French Psalter (apparently published in 1539); and although his own contributions soon became obsolete,

History. French psalmody, as a literary and musical phenomenon, is deeply rooted in his personality. As poetry the French Psalter goes back to Clement Marot (q.v.), who translated thirty-nine Psalms, his work being completed by Beza in 1562. As a writer of verse, Beza could make no claim to stand on the poetical level of Marot, but his work proved popular and went through innumerable editions. The following bibliographical account may suffice for the history of the French Psalter. In 1539 there appeared at Strasburg the anonymous *Aulcuns pseaulmes et cantiques mys en chant*, containing twenty-one texts and including the first fourteen translations of Marot and five Psalms of Calvin, among the melodies being the famous Strasburg "Es sind doch selig alle die" (to Psalm cxix.) of 1525. After Calvin's return to Geneva in 1541, there appeared in Strasburg the second psalter, called the Pseudo-Roman, since its title-page alleged that it was printed at Rome with the privilege of the pope. In addition to the whole collection of 1539, it contained eighteen other Psalms and the metrical Lord's Prayer of Marot, four psalms of various writers, and a total of nine new melodies (3d ed., 1545). In 1542 there was printed at Geneva the *Forme des prières*, which became the standard Geneva Psalter, containing thirty psalms, the Lord's Prayer, and the creed by Marot, and five Psalms with the Song of Simeon and the Ten Commandments by Calvin. Of the melodies seventeen were more or less changed, and twenty-two were new. In the Geneva Psalter of 1543, Calvin's poetical versions no longer appear. The editions after 1547 were entitled *Pseaulmes cinquante de David*, and musical changes were introduced from time to time. After 1551 the title of the French Psalter became *Pseaumes octante trois de David*. The edition of 1551 included thirty-four compositions of Beza and forty-seven new melodies. After a number of editions with minor variations, the work appeared in final form at Geneva and Paris in 1562, with the title *Les Pseaumes mis en rime françoise*. This contained the whole Psalter with 150 melodies (many of them being repeated), the Decalogue, the Song of Simeon, two forms of grace, the Lord's Prayer, and the creed. By 1565 the work had run through sixty-two editions, and had been translated into German by Ambrosius Lobwasser (q.v.).

The origin of the melodies has been investigated with great care. It is certain that the music which accompanies the translation is derived

Sources, Authors, Influence. from secular sources. Sport or dance music was not directly adopted, though the tonal elements were worked over for religious purposes. In some thirty-five cases secular melodies can be traced as the originals of Psalm tunes, though it must be remembered that many of these had long been used in both public and private Protestant devotions. The melodies fall into two groups: eighty-five of uniform type or revision, collected in 1542–54, and in some cases probably composed by Louis Bourgeois (c. 1510–72); and forty melodies added in 1562, composed by an unknown successor of Bourgeois of very inferior talents. It is necessary, however, to distinguish between the composers and the arrangers of the melodies. Among the former mention should be made of Guillaume Franc (c. 1510–1570), whom Beza, while in Lausanne, employed to compose forty melodies, which gradually were superseded by those current at Geneva; while one of the most prominent of the latter was Claude Goudimel (q.v.). A second distinguished harmonist of the French Psalter was Claude (or Claudin) Lejeune (c. 1530–1600), the greater part of whose contributions were published posthumously.

French Psalm music is generally recognized for its superior qualities wherever congregational singing is practised. Eighty-four melodies of the French Psalter are in use in the Protestant churches of Germany, a significant fact in consideration of the number of compositions originating in German Protestantism itself. The number of German tunes introduced into the French Psalter, on the other hand, is very small compared with this list, although the Strasburg melody of Psalm cxix. and the Strasburg system of singing the Ten Commandments were permanently adopted, while a number of other German Psalm tunes were used for a longer or shorter time. French Psalm melodies were also much employed outside of France, the Psalter being translated for its melodies into Dutch, English, Danish, Polish, Hungarian, Bohemian, Rhætian, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, etc. Many of these melodies are still retained in Bohemian, Finnish, and American hymnals and choral books. They were even adopted in varying degrees by local Roman Catholic hymnals, the Eichsfeld hymnal (Langensalza, 1871) still retaining five. (J. SMEND.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: C. J. Riggenbach, *Der Kirchengesang in Basel seit der Reformation*, Basel, 1870; F. Bovet, *Hist. du psautier huguenot*, vols. i.–ii., Paris, 1878–79; S. Kümmerle, *Encyklopädie der evangel. Kirchenmusik*, vols. i.–ii., Gütersloh, 1888–90 (consult articles "Bourgeois," "G. Franc," "Goudimel," "Lejeune," "Lobwasser," "Der Liederpsalter der reformierten Kirche"); J. Zahn, *Die Melodien der deutschen evangelischen Kirchenlieder*, vols. i.–vi., Gütersloh, 1889–93; P. Wolfrum, *Die Entstehung und erste Entwickelung des deutschen evangelischen Kirchenliedes in musikalischer Beziehung*, pp. 79, 89–90, 96–98, 112–113, 123–139, Leipsic, 1890.

PSALMODY.

Psalmody in the Bible (§ 1).
Post-Biblical Psalmody (§ 2).
Protestant Psalmody (§ 3).
The Psalm Tones (§ 4).
Origin of Christian Psalmody (§ 5).
History (§ 6).

Psalmody literally signifies the singing of psalms, and hence of hymns in general. In the wider sense of the term it frequently denotes sacred song in distinction from worldly, or church singing as contrasted with secular. More specifically the term is applied to the Breviary (q.v.) in so far as the chanting of Psalms is the main object of that compilation, while in a more technical sense it denotes the liturgical rendering of the Psalms, or portions of them, as prescribed by the Church. Restricting psalmody for the nonce to its literal meaning of Psalm-singing, the history of the liturgical use of the Psalter will here be summarized, reference being made for the origin, authorship, date, and first purpose of the collection to the article PSALMS, BOOK OF.

1. Psalmody in the Bible.

The psalmody of the Old Testament, still overlaid by the ceremonialism of the Mosaic code, is the subject of a clear allusion in the Davidic legislation (I Chron. xxiii. 5, 30), while the dedication of the Temple gave type to the entire service (II Chron. v. 11–13). In the subsequent prophetic books the Psalms emerge at all national crises. Their jubilant refrains ring clear in the prophets (Jer. xxxiii. 11); Amos (vi. 5) recognizes the sacredness of the Davidic music already grown proverbial; and Isaiah abounds in echoes of the Psalter. The New Testament accepts fully the Psalms of the Old Covenant. The Acts institute the apostolic régime, with the Psalter in full view, furnishing Peter's sermon and inspiring Pentecost. Distinct evidence shows that the Psalter was the fixed devotional formulary which wrought the accord, steadfastness, and praiseful spirit on that occasion among the thousands gathered at Jerusalem from many lands. At Corinth the irregular outburst of the charismata (I Cor. xiv.), when each one, without regard to the other, had his "psalm," received apostolic rebuke. The celebrated passages authorizing New-Testament psalmody are Eph. v. 19 and Col. iii. 16. James (v. 13) urges his scattered Jewish brethren to the use of the Psalms, and Revelation closes the New Testament with quotations from the Psalter. Between Babylon's fall and the millennium a fourfold Hallelujah is sounded (xix. 1–8), followed by the declaration that "the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy." This must be taken with an earlier statement (iii. 7), where, as in Heb. iv. 7, "David" stands for the Psalms, revealing Jesus as "he that is holy, he that is true, he that hath the key of David."

2. Post-Biblical Psalmody.

During the first two centuries A.D. the Psalter retained its position of honor and sanctity. Early Christians were essentially "children of the Psalms," and the Psalms, the Sabbath, and the inflexible confession of Christ were the chief badges of Christian loyalty. A marked change came, however, with the Gnostic Bardesanes (q.v.), who composed a psalter of 150 Psalms modelled on the Old-Testament collection. Aided by his son Harmonius, he set the standard of Syrian music and hymnody. A century later Ephraem Syrus (q.v.), though inferior in originality to Bardesanes, sought to copy and Christianize his hymns, and to reclaim the ground for Christianity. He at least succeeded in securing a large following of admirers, who named him "Prophet of the Syrians" and "Harp of the Spirit," read his writings as Scripture, and welcomed him as the first Christian hymnologist, although, like Bardesanes, he sacrificed the Psalter. The hymn of Clement of Alexandria, "Bridle of colts untamed," ends with the exhortation, "let us praise with Psalms (*psalōmen*) the God of peace." Through succeeding centuries of persecution the Psalms continued to hold their place, with but trifling exceptions, as the Church's hymnology among the people and the most earnest preachers, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Jerome, and Augustine. Except for the sequences and a few very short hymns, some of them centos of Psalms, these were the universal hymns of the Church. Many refused to sing the hymns and sequences, and the fifty-ninth canon of the Synod of Laodicea (360) accordingly enjoined that "no psalms composed by private individuals nor any uncanonical books may be read in the church, but only the Canonical Books of the Old and New Testaments" (*NPNF*, 2 ser., xiv. 158). In the West the Psalms were sung in responses in choir long after Latin had ceased to be vernacular. The eighth canon of the Council of Toledo (653; as given in Labbe, *Concilia*, vii. 421) ordered that "none henceforth shall be promoted

to any ecclesiastical dignity who does not perfectly know the whole Psalter or the usual canticles and hymns and service of baptism" (cf. Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, iii. 99, Fr. transl. iii. 1, p. 291, Eng. transl. iv. 471).

3. Protestant Psalmody.

With the Reformation psalmody definitely accentuated its underlying principle—the authority of the Scriptures in all that pertains to faith, worship, and life. Huss first broke ground in the metrical use of the Psalms. As early as 1524 Luther wrote Spalatin to secure poets to prepare them for church uses (St. Louis ed. of Luther, xx*a*, cols. 582–583), but it was only twenty-three years later that the work was completed (see PSALM MELODIES, FRENCH). So popular was the result that in some instances Roman Catholics also adopted the psalter of Calvin, although the Jesuit Adam Contzen declared that the hymns of Luther and the psalms of Beza killed more than their books did (*Politicorum libri decem*, Cologne, 1629). In his preface to the edition of 1545 Calvin wrote: "When we sing them (the Psalms), we are as certain that God has put the words in our mouths as if he himself sang within us to exalt his glory" (*Opera*, ed. J. W. Baum and others, vi. 171). The history of psalmody in England and Scotland is outlined in HYMNOLOGY, IX., § 2. In the English colonies of North America the first hymns sung were Psalms, by the Pilgrim fathers in the paraphrase of Henry Ainsworth and by the Indians in John Eliot's version, and the first book printed in British North America was the *Bay Psalm Book* (q.v.). The Psalms practically reigned supreme in the colonies until the outbreak of the American Revolution, when various causes opened the way for the hymns of Isaac Watts (q.v.), which were "allowed," not authorized, by the Presbyterian synod at Philadelphia in 1787. This was the first distinct breaking away from the original principle of the Reformation—the Bible only.

In 1719 Isaac Watts made a complete innovation by his *Psalms of David*, in which, while preserving the name and numbering of the Psalms, he so modified them as to open the way for unrestricted hymnody, his plea being that he would make David speak the language of a Christian, not of a Jew. The decay of real psalmody, combined with other causes, was the preparation for the great popularity of this hymnody. Nevertheless, such critics as James Beattie and Samuel Johnson expressed disapproval, and many others were sorely grieved, while the evangelical Anglican William Romaine, in his *Essay on Psalmody* (London, 1775) voiced their sentiment in no uncertain language. Never since has the great body of the Church returned to the Reformation attitude regarding psalmody. Previous to Watts, however, English Churchmen and non-conformists alike had been true to the Psalms. The Baptists met the question and furnished some distinct witnesses, such as John Gill (q.v.); and the Quaker Robert Barclay (q.v.) also commended the spiritual singing of Psalms. The great Methodist movement was only indirectly unfriendly to the Psalms. The Wesleys expressed great love for them, and Charles Wesley furnished metrical versions for most of them. Adam Clarke (q.v.) favored the singing of Psalms in the most faithful version, and George Whitefield (q.v.) likewise sympathized with a true psalmody.

The present witnesses for exclusive psalmody do not exceed half a million, scattered in seventeen denominations of Presbyterians, particularly the United Presbyterian body (see PRESBYTERIANS). Their influence, however, is beyond all proportion to their numbers on account of their educational and missionary activity. That a purely Biblical Psalmody is still not an antiquated or obsolescent principle in these churches, but has in them, as in apostolic and immediately post-apostolic times, its representative, without paraphrastic mixture or credal and liturgical sequences, is evidenced by the fact that a new and carefully prepared metrical Psalter is now (1910) in process of publication (see below). This work has been under way for a considerable period and has been the subject of several revisions and overtures in the United Presbyterian body which took the lead in the enterprise and is entrusted with the responsibility for its completion. It has been said that had they, like the Baptists, made duly prominent the distinctive characteristic in which they all agree, they would now have as large a membership. They have allowed themselves, however, rather to follow than lead in the meters and music of their Psalms, and to cling too fondly to catechisms and confessions which glorify prayer and preaching, but ignore psalmody. A "testimony," or formal official expression of opinion, on this subject could never take rank with the original confession; and the failure of the Psalm-singing churches to realize in practise the entire theology of the Psalms accounts in part for their limited success. The new metrical Psalter mentioned above as being in process of publication is the joint work of committees from nine churches (one in Canada), and covers a period of ten years of faithful preparation. It seeks to reproduce the Hebrew verity without paraphrase and with due regard at the same time to poetic structure and musical adaptation.

ROBERT BREWSTER TAGGART.

4. The Psalm Tones.

Musically speaking, psalmody occupies an intermediate position between the so-called *accentus*, i.e., liturgical intonation or recitative, and the so-called *concentus*, or elaborated singing (in the sense of the ancient theory of tones). In practise it conforms to the "Psalm tones" as fixed by the Church. Corresponding to the eight divisions of the octave in ancient music, which are preserved by the Church in her eight church tones, there are eight Psalm tones. These were augmented, in course of time, by a ninth, or "foreign," tone, which is usually treated as a separate tone since opinions differ in regard to its harmonic structure. It occurs in the antiphon *Sed nos qui vivimus* to Psalm cxiii (Vulgate; A. V. cxiv.–cxv.) in vespers for Sundays, and in the antiphons *Martyres Domini* and *Angeli Domini;* while in the Lutheran Church it has come to be the usual tone for the *Magnificat* and the Aaronic benediction (Num. vi. 24–26). By some this "pilgrim tone" is classed with the first

tone, and by others with the eighth, although it strictly accords with neither, so that it is also termed the "irregular tone." Each Psalm tone is characterized, in the first place, by the tone to be followed in the intonation of the Psalm text in question. This is always the dominant of the given key to which the Psalm tone belongs, and is called the tone of intonation, leading tone, "common tone," or, as a rule, simply "dominant." Again, each Psalm tone is distinguished by the melodic cæsura, which ends the first half of the verse, and which is termed the *mediante*, middle, *medium*, or *mediatio;* as well as by the melodic intonation which ends the entire verse, this terminal phrase being known as the *finale*, "conclusion," or "cadence." The conclusion of the Psalm tone is not identical with the so-called final tone of the key, nor need it coalesce with the latter tone at all, so that it does not determine the church tone to which the Psalm tone belongs. Each Psalm tone has also a festal and a ferial form. In the latter the preliminary melodic embellishment (*initium, inchoatio, intonatio*) is omitted, while the *mediante* is simplified by resolving the ligatures and substituting syllabic chanting. The ferial form is employed on ordinary doubles, Sundays, and semi-doubles at prime, terce, sext, none, and compline, as well as on simples and on ordinary week-days, and invariably in the office for the dead. The festal form is used throughout the office on all doubles of the first and second class and on greater doubles; and it is also employed, at least at matins, lauds, and vespers, on ordinary doubles, Sundays, and semi-doubles, as well as in the canticles from the New Testament, the *Magnificat* and *Benedictus*. This festal form is characterized by its *initium*, or "beginning," a melodic embellishment of the introductory note which forms the transition to the recitative, or intonation proper. This festal embellishment, however, is retained for every verse only in the case of the "greater Psalms," or New-Testament canticles, for in the "lesser Psalms," or Psalms of the Old Testament, it is omitted after the second verse. Each Psalm must end with the *Gloria Patri*, which makes it a prayer of the Christian Church. Complete ritual also demands the antiphon (q.v.), and a distinction is accordingly drawn between the "Psalm without antiphon" (or "direct Psalm"), when the Psalm has no introductory antiphon and is sung without additions and interruptions, and the "Psalm with an antiphon."

5. Origin of Christian Psalmody.

With the Psalter the Christian Church naturally adopted the traditional mode of psalmody. While the musical details are obscure, this adoption doubtless involved Christian antiphonal singing as essential to psalmody, being based on the parallelism of Hebrew poetry. A distinction is drawn between the responsory, in which the precentor renders the entire Psalm, while the choir or congregation sings a refrain after each verse, an *Amen* or *Hallelujah* (cf. Rev. v. 14, xix. 4), some form of praise contained in the Psalm itself, or some such doxology as the *Gloria Patri* (cf. Apostolic Constitutions, ii. 57 [*ANF*, vii. 421]: "Let some other person sing the hymns of David, and let the people join at the conclusions of the verses"), and the antiphonal style, in which either the precentor and the choir (or congregation), or two choirs, or the two halves of the choir, alternate in rendering the Psalm (cf. Basil, *Ep.* ccvii. 3 [*NPNF*, 2 ser., viii. 247]: "Divided into two parts, they sing antiphonally with one another, . afterward they again commit the prelude of the strain to one, and the rest take it up").

To prove that the highly developed music of classic antiquity affected the evolution of antiphonal singing is more difficult, for this involved the adoption of a system of artificial music which strict Christian sensibilities abhorred and mistrusted, possibly implying the use of antiphons sung by many voices or accompanied by instrumental music. In classical music "antiphonal" denoted the consonance of the octave, and the proper antiphon was produced where men and children sang together with voices differing as to pitch. At the same time, in this style of joint choral and polyphonic song appeal could be made to the precedent of the Jewish Temple. The problem was not the introduction of antiphonal singing (in contrast with what was later understood as non-antiphonal song), but the adoption of artistic antiphonal singing in distinction from the simple psalmody of the time. The artistic amplification of liturgical singing after the prototype of the trained choirs of the Greeks is implied, moreover, in the account given by Philo (quoted by Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, II., xvii. 22 [*NPNF*, 2 series, i. 119]) of the ritual of the Therapeutæ, which is compared with that of the contemporary Christian worship. Basil the Great likewise states (*Epist.* ccvii. 3 [Eng. transl. in *NPNF*, 2 ser., viii. 247]) that he had the Psalms rendered by skilled precentors after the manner of the triumphal odes of Pindar, the congregation joining, at the closing verse, with an accompaniment of lyres.

6. History.

At all events, the liturgical rendering or chanting of the Psalms became the function of a specially trained precentor at a very early date in the Christian Church, if, indeed, this was not the case from the very first, especially as no other practise has been transmitted from the synagogue itself; and the congregation gave only the responses. As the connection of the Church with Judaism became broken, the liturgical forms and modes of Jewish psalmody must have grown strange; yet even when psalmody became transformed under the influence of classical music, its form of expression could be no common and familiar one, but was necessarily a work of art. Psalmody accordingly came to be more and more exclusively the province of duly trained and practised singers, the choir. The fifteenth canon of the Synod of Laodicea (c. 360) prescribes that "no others shall sing in the Church, save only the canonical singers, who go up into the ambo and sing from a book" [*NPNF*, 2 series, xiv. 132]. In the Greek Church, the Psalms are rendered by the choir in two sections, alternating verse by verse, with or without interpolation of a brief sentence of praise (embolism) as the Psalm proceeds; and in the Roman Catholic Church the proper chanting of Psalms is accounted a test of the good liturgical training of the choir. The antiphon is

to be started by a solo voice, the choir then taking up the chant.

In so far as the Lutheran Church adopted psalmody, the traditional mode was followed to the extent that the antiphon was led by the choir master, or by boys (usually two) specially selected and trained. Then came the Psalm itself, rendered, as a rule, antiphonally verse by verse, the whole being concluded by the lesser doxology and the repetition of the antiphon in the choir. The singing was usually without organ accompaniment. Since psalmody thus became the function of the choir, it assumed the character of a performance in vocal music, rather than its proper place as an act of prayer in song on the part of the congregation. With the correct intuition that what the congregation prays in song must speak its own language by text and tune alike, either versified psalters (Theodore Beza and Clement Marot in France, see PSALM MELODIES, FRENCH; Burkhard Waldis, Ambrosius Lobwasser, and Kornelius Becker in Germany; Petrus Dathenus in Holland; William Damon, Nahum Tate, and Nicholas Brady in England; and Giovanni Diodati in Italy) or hymns of a popular character were prepared. In most Protestant regions these hymns came to be a substitute for psalmody, which was still further supplanted by simple reading of the Psalms for purposes of edification. See also SACRED MUSIC. H. A. KÖSTLIN†.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: On §§ 1-3: Early treatises are: Germanus, *De psalmodiæ bono;* Alcuin, *De psalmorum usu;* Teraldus, *De varia psalmorum atque cantuum modulatione;* Dionysius the Carthusian, *De modo devote psallendi;* J. Morinus, *De psalmodiæ bono* (reproduced in *Revue bénédictine*, xiv. 385 sqq., 1897); J. Bona, *De divina psalmodia*, chap. 19, Paris, 1663.

Consult further: A. H. Francke, *Introductio in Psalterium*, Halle, 1734; J. van Iperen, *Kerkelyke historie van het Psalm-gezang der Christenen*, 2 vols., Amsterdam, 1777; G. McMaster, *An Apology for the Book of Psalms*, Philadelphia, 1818; A. Hahn, *Bardesanes Gnosticus Syrorum primus hymnologus*, Leipsic, 1819; F. Armknecht, *Die heilige Psalmodie*, Göttingen, 1855; F. J. Wolf, *Ueber die Lais, Sequenzen und Leiche*, Heidelberg, 1841; J. Holland, *The Psalmists of Britain*, 2 vols., London, 1843; G. Hood, *A History of Music in New England; with biographical Sketches of Reformers and Psalmists*, Boston, 1846; Otto Strauss, *Der Psalter als Gesang- und Gebetbuch*, Berlin, 1859; Joseph S. Cooper, ed., *True Psalmody*, Philadelphia, 1859; Austin Phelps, *Hymns and Choirs*, Andover, 1860; I. Taylor, *The Spirit of Hebrew Poetry*, London, 1861; F. E. C. Dietrich, *De usu Psalterii in ecclesia Syriaca*, Marburg, 1862; A. Hilgenfeld, *Bardesanes der letzte Gnostiker*, Leipsic, 1864; N. Livingston, *Scottish Metrical Psalter of 1635*, Glasgow, 1864; J. W. Macmeeken, *History of the Scottish Metrical Psalters*, Glasgow, 1872; F. Bovet, *Histoire du Psautier des Églises réformées*, Neuchâtel, 1872; J. J. Goadby, *Bye-paths in Baptist History*, London, 1871; E. O. Douen, *Clement Marot et le Psautier Huguenot*, 2 vols., Paris, 1878-79; William Binnie, *The Psalms: their History, Teachings and Use*, London, 1870, new ed., 1886; J. S. Curwen, *Studies in Worship-Music*, 2 series, 3 vols., London, 1880-87; Mrs. A. M. Earle, *The Sabbath in Puritan New England*, New York, 1891; J. C. Haddon, *Literary Materials of the First Scottish Psalter*, in *Scottish Review*, vii (1891), 1-32; C. G. McCrie, *Public Worship in Presbyterian Scotland*, Edinburgh, 1892; W. H. Parker, *The Psalmody of the Church, its Authors, Singers and Uses*, New York, 1892; R. Bell, *The Story of the Scotch Psalms*, in *The Scotsman*, new series, xix (1896-97), 234-40; J. W. Clokey, *David's Harp in Song and Story, with Introduction by W. J. Robinson, a History of the Psalms in all Ages of the Church*, Pittsburg, 1896; P. Wagner, *Ueber den Psalmgesang im christlichen Altertum* (in "Reports" of the International Scientific Congress of Catholics, at Freiburg, 1897); idem, *Ursprung und Entwickelung der liturgischen Gesangsformen*, Freiburg, 1901; P. Wagner, *Ueber Psalmen und Psalmengesang im christlichen Altertum*, in *Römische Quartalschrift*, xii (1898), 245-279; E. Soullier, *Les Origines de la psalmodie*, Paris, 1901; J. W. Thirtle, *The Titles of the Psalms*, 2d ed., London, 1905; idem, *Old Testament Problems*, ib. 1907; R. E. Prothero, *The Psalms in Human Life*, New York, 1905; C. A. Briggs, *Commentary on the Psalms* (introduction), ib. 1906; J. McNaugher (ed.), *The Psalms in Worship, Convention Papers bearing upon the Place of the Psalms in the Worship of the Church*, Pittsburg, 1907; D. F. Bonner, *The Psalmody Question: An Examination of the alleged divine Appointment of the Book of Psalms as the exclusive Manual of Praise*, New York, 1908; A. R. Whitham, *Christian Use of the Psalter*, London, 1908; T. Young, *The Metrical Psalms and Paraphrases*, ib., 1909.

On §§ 4-6, consult, besides the rather abundant literature cited under SACRED MUSIC: G. G. Nivers, *Dissertation sur le chant grégorien*, chap. xiii., Paris, 1683; K. Calvör, *De musica ac sigillatim de ecclesiastica eoque spectantibus organis*, chap. iii., Leipsic, 1702; F. Armknecht, *Die heilige Psalmodie, oder der psalmodierende König David*, Göttingen, 1855; L. Schöberlein, *Schatz des liturgischen Chor- und Gemeindegesangs*, ib. 1865; J. W. Lyra, *Die liturgischen Altarweisen des lutherischen Hauptgottesdienstes*, ib. 1873; idem, *Andreas Ornithoparchus und dessen Lehre von den Kirchenaccenten*, pp. 19 sqq., 31 sqq., Gütersloh, 1877; idem, *Dr. M. Luthers Deutsche Messe und Ordnung des Gottesdienstes in ihren liturgischen und musikalischen Bestandteilen*, ib. 1904; R. Succo, *Zehn Psalmen nach den Melodien der Psalmtöne*, ib. 1895; F. Hommel, *Antiphonen und Psalmtöne*, ib. 1896; E. Clop des Sonrinières, *Le Chant dans l'ordre séraphique*, Solesmes, 1900; A. J. Duclos, *Introduction à l'exécution du chant grégorien d'après les principles de Solesmes*, Rome, 1904; C. Ginisty, *Échos grégoriens des deux centenaires*, Paris, 1904; R. Molitor, *Der gregorianische Choral als Liturgie und Kunst*, Frankfort, 1904; C. Vivell, *Der gregorianische Gesang*, Graz, 1904; G. Houdard, *La Cantilène romaine*, Paris, 1905.

PSALMS, BOOK OF.

I. Introduction.
Names (§ 1).
Classification (§ 2).
II. Purpose.
Relation to Worship (§ 1).
Original and Adapted Purpose (§ 2).
Varied Voices of the Psalms (§ 3).
III. History of the Collection.
Indications of Early Smaller Collections (§ 1).
The Process of Collection (§ 2).
The Date (§ 3).
IV. The Ego of the Psalms.
Varied Explanations (§ 1).
Solution Independent of Age and Purpose (§ 2).
V. Authorship and Date.
The Titles (§ 1).
Modern Phase of the Problem (§ 2).
Are there Pre-exilic Psalms? (§ 3).
Indications of Davidic Authorship (§ 4).
Explanations of Title "of David" (§ 5).
Recognition of Late Psalms (§ 6).
Comparison with Psalms of Solomon (§ 7).
VI. Theology.
Doctrine of God and of Righteousness (§ 1).
Ideas of Sin and Eschatology (§ 2).

I. Introduction: In the present arrangement of the Hebrew Bible the book of Psalms stands at the head of the third division, the Hagiographa or Kethubhim. But this order is not invariable, since sometimes that division is headed by Chronicles or by Ruth. According to the Hebrew, the title is *Tehillim*, from the word meaning "to praise," thus designating the psalms as songs of praise. But this designation expresses not so much the content as the external employment. At the end of Ps. lxxii.

occurs the term *Tephillim*, "prayers," and this better fits the contents as expressing a larger portion of the subject-matter of the book.

1. Names. This term is, however, not altogether appropriate, since it does not include psalms of didactic purpose within its proper meaning. The Greek calls the collection the "book of psalms," "psalms," or *Psalterion*—the latter term the name of a stringed instrument used by metonymy for the songs which the instrument accompanied. A word used by the collector of the book in the sense of the Greek *psalmos* and the English "psalm" is the Hebrew *mizmor*, used in the titles of fifty-seven psalms. The word comes from a verb which has the double meaning, "to trim vines" and "to sing or play," with perhaps an original sense, "to pluck." The Septuagint translates it by *psalmos*, Aquila by *melodema*, Symmachus by *odē*, and Jerome by *canticum;* within the Old Testament the word is used only of religious poems.

The Hebrew Psalter consists of 150 psalms divided into five books, each of which ends with a doxology except the fifth, in which the last psalm is a doxology in itself. The Septua-

2. Classification. gint has 151 psalms, the last one being a composite from I Sam. xvi. 1–14 and xvii.; the Hebrew psalms ix. and x. it counts as one psalm, also cxiv. and cxv., while it divides into two both Ps. cxvi. and cxlvii. The consequence is a disagreement in the numbering of the Hebrew and the Greek psalms. Classification of the psalms is difficult because not a few of them partake of more than one characteristic. Thus many psalms begin with lament or prayer and change into thanksgiving and praise (e.g., Ps. xxii.). Hengstenberg divided the psalms into those in which the dominant note is praise, those in which it is lamentation because of private or national sorrow, and those in which the religious-ethical is most emphasized. From the material standpoint a division might take into account such psalms as are properly hymns, being songs of praise from personal points of view, and those which make some petition. A characteristic variety here is the poem of prayer, especially the lament which naturally issues in a prayer for deliverance. Hymns of thanksgiving may be included here, inasmuch as the principal note is thought of some special good. Of course this class is subject to many subdivisions. Thus there may be taken into account the degree of subjectivity or objectivity, reference to the individual or the nation; also the idea of God expressed—whether he is regarded as Lord and Creator, or as savior, whether as guide of the nation or of the soul, as the giver of his word and his law. Alongside of these classes may be placed the didactic psalms, such as xxxi., lxxiii.; these may be purely theological, or legalistic. So psalms may be considered as hymns, prayers of various sorts, liturgical pieces, dithyrambic poems, epic poems, moralistic pieces, or religious-philosophic poems.

II. Purpose: Little direct information has come down respecting the aim of the psalms and their relation to worship. It might be claimed that the connection with Hebrew worship is so loose that the psalms are a sort of private collection, an anthology of religious poetry. The titles in the Hebrew indicate for Ps. xxx. that its use was at the dedication of the temple, and that Ps. xcii. was for the Sabbath; the Septuagint titles

1. Relation to Worship. of Pss. xxiv., xlviii., xciv., and xciii. indicate that these psalms were for use on Sunday, Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, later translations add lxxxii. for Thursday, and the Septuagint assigns xxix. for the Feast of Tabernacles; the Talmud prescribes lxxxii. for Tuesday. Besides these, the Talmud knows of assignments of five psalms and the Hallel collection (see HALLEL) for certain feasts, while the prayer-book of the synagogue makes a few additions to these definite assignments of psalms for use in public worship. It appears, therefore, that until quite late only a very small proportion of the psalms bear the marks of definite relation to public worship. The more welcome then is indirect proof of such use. The first place is taken in this direction by the fact that certain of the psalms are liturgical in character. Such appear in the first book, and the farther one goes in the Psalter, the more frequent do liturgical psalms become. Thus in this class belong the Hallelujah psalms (cf. I Chron. xvi. 36; Ps. cvi. 48); where the response of the people is given. The frequent mention of the chorus in Chronicles is further evidence of this sort, as well as Ps. cvi. 6; cf. Dan. ix. 5; Neh. ix. 16. Ps. cvi. is a psalm of public confession. When it is seen that some psalms by their titles, others by their inclusion in the Korahitic and Asaphic collections, and others by later titles are designated for public worship, the conclusion is clear that if not by first intent yet through their assembling in the present collection the psalms were intended for use by the community, which thus was enabled to take part in public worship.

If one looks for the original purpose of the writer, in some cases public use appears to have been intended; though in many others such a purpose is excluded by the character of the composition, as when the psalm has a didactic or his-

2. Original and Adapted Purpose. torical or epic character rather than a lyrical. A striking case of this is Ps. cxix. Possibly such psalms were rather for free recitation, others seem to be purely literary in character, and the use of these in service may have come much later. The strongly individual character of many of these compositions is against the idea that they were written for public use; their suitability to express the feelings of others accounts for their adoption; or their expressions were generalized. On the other hand, many of these same psalms may have been individualized by recension. Two opposite directions may have been taken in the process of working over, in which the half-conscious tendency of the poet was elaborated in revision. Such results are suggested in the messianizing of many poems. Of special suggestiveness are those psalms which deal with the temple and with ritual, particularly those which deal with sacrifice. The question arises whether in these cases the reference is real or only illustrative or constructive. Jakob and Matthes (see bibliography) maintain that there was not merely adaptation but initiative and crea-

tive purpose here, intending them for worship. Those psalms which refer to appearance in God's presence, or to abiding in that presence, indicate for themselves a relation to the temple and to worship. Examples of this significant type of expression are found in xv 1, xxiv. 3, xxvii. 4, xxvi. 8, lxxxiv. 3. As there can be no doubt that to the poets of these psalms the highest good results from intimacy with God, so this intimacy is achieved by presence at the services of the temple. Indeed, presence in the temple, lingering in the presence of God, enjoying the hospitality of his house, are often the external means of participation in communion with God. Indeed, relation to the temple and its services has a great part in the Psalter. Psalms such as those cited were written with the eye upon the center of worship and the cult there domiciled, and had their motive been other than this, had they been merely figurative, they would have read differently.

Nevertheless, such an impression is not derived from all the psalms. Some psalms exist which echo the declaration that obedience is better than sacrifice—a purely prophetic thought (cf. Pss. xl., l., li.). Were there not such passages as Isa. i. 11 sqq.; Amos v. 21 sqq., proving that there was present in Israel a realization that the external cultus as opposed to the ethical content and intent to worship God was of little worth, there might be doubt how such psalms as those just cited are to be taken; as it is, their meaning can not come into question. The twisting of these into a sense friendly to sacrifice is a rabbinical achievement, the value of which is to show how Jewish exegesis made it possible to include such compositions in the Psalter; it shows us the course of rabbinic thought. That the rabbis would receive into the worship-book psalms which, as they were understood, opposed sacrifice seems very strange; the only way to account for the phenomenon is that the sense was taken as different from the literal. Matthes has rightly acknowledged the importance of the exegesis of Jakob in interpreting Ps. xl. 6, li. 17, as not referring to a slain victim but to a repast, and in xl. 6, eliminating the "offering" after "sin." Yet in the place of these conceptions something little better is placed. What is said here is simply that exactness of performance at a given time is not what God wants. During the exile and the Syrian persecution, for external reasons the office of sacrifice was suspended, and God was satisfied with repentance and fulfilment of the other requirements of the law. As soon as the walls of Jerusalem were rebuilt, then would God take delight in sacrifice (Ps. li. 18–19). To explain l. 14 as referring to personal, special, and private offerings in opposition to the regular and public sacrifices is opposed to the immediate context and to the drift of the entire psalm (cf. verses 12–13). In short, the Psalter is full of references to the service of the temple, but this does not justify one in calling it the hymn-book of the second temple, especially if he regards the original purpose of its songs; indeed originally not a few of its psalms were not suited for such a service, but were accommodated to that use by the secondary process of editing.

3. Varied Voices of the Psalms.

III. History of the Collection: The history of psalm composition as well as the discussion of the origin of the individual poems must start with a consideration of the origin of the collection. The points made by William Robertson Smith give the line of departure. The division of the Psalter into five books has already been mentioned. The first book (Pss. i.–xli.) is ascribed to David (except i., ii., x., xxxiii.); the second (xlii.–lxxii.) chiefly to David and Asaph; the third (lxxiii.–lxxxix.) to Asaph, Korah, and other temple singers (only lxxxvi. to David); the fourth (xc.–cvi.) is of psalms principally anonymous; the fifth contains many ascribed to David, and the "songs of ascents." This analysis shows a close connection between books two and three, in that those alone contain the psalms of the gilds of temple singers, which have a prominent position. There is implied either composition by these gilds or (more likely) a legitimate adaptation to service, perhaps by setting the compositions to music after the manner of modern makers of hymnological collections. In this case, the "of" of the superscriptions stands not for authorship but for possession. It is to be noticed that the hymns attributed to these authors or gilds stand in little collections. But there are other leading facts. Prominent among these is the verse lxxii. 20, indicating that at this point a Davidic collection once ended; alongside this must be put another fact that in this collection are psalms which are not ascribed to David (note the Asaphic and Korahitic psalms), and, still further, despite the ending of Ps. lxxii., other Davidic psalms are in the present collection in the books which follow. It looks, moreover, as though the Davidic collection consisted of Ps. i. (iii.)–xli. and li.–lxxii., the last of which, ascribed to Solomon, was included because ascribed to David's son. Next is to be noted that the two parts named above, Pss. iii.–xli. and li.–lxxii. contain duplicates (Ps. xiv.=liii., and xl. 13–17=lxx.). This suggests two collections for the most part different, but in these cases containing identical pieces. Possibly the collections contained other identical psalms, which were eliminated when they were united, these two doublets alone being left. Tradition is firm that a division existed early after Ps. xli. And the indications are that there were two Davidic collections and two smaller Davidic books, embracing Ps. iii., xli., and li.–lxxii. (lxxii.). A step in advance is made when it is observed that the change in the name of the deity familiar from study of the Pentateuch exists also here. Thus books two and three are prevailingly Elohistic, while books one, four, and five are prevailingly Jehovistic. This is noteworthy when it is seen that the doublets cited above are in different recensions in this respect, each corresponding in use of the divine name with the collection in which it stands. Of course this variation was not original, it must have come in through editorial work. Analogous phenomena in Chronicles reveal that there was a time when people began to avoid the name Yahweh and to use the more general term Elohim —passages from Samuel and Kings which are Jehovistic become Elohistic in Chronicles. This is not

1. Indications of Early Smaller Collections.

accidental, it is part of a system; it is consonant with the substitution of Adonai for the tetragrammaton *Yhwh* by the Masoretes, the difference is that the Chronicler did not hesitate to change the text; the Masoretes did not change this, but made their alterations in the margin. But a fact of importance is that the latest books become Jehovistic once more. In many cases the use of Elohim must be ascribed not to the poets but to the redactor. The two Davidic collections named show one the Jehovistic and the other the Elohistic trend. When it is seen that the Asaphic and Korahitic collections are prevailingly Elohistic, it may seem that the Elohistic character of Pss. li.–lxxii. may have been gained from contact with the neighboring Psalms. Books four and five are much mixed. Along with many which have Davidic superscriptions are many anonymous, and with these the pilgrim psalms. In view of the various classes of poems here collected, it seems as though a collector had chosen from the various sources at his command such pieces as seemed to him worthy and suitable to transmit to the future.

These data permit a view of the probable course of development of the Psalter. It appears that a Jehovistic redactor made a first collection of Davidic songs. An Elohistic redactor made from three or four prior collections (a Davidic, a Korahitic, and an Asaphic book), an Elohistic collection, to which as an appendix were attached various ethical pieces. A Jehovistic redactor made, out of various smaller aggregations such as the Pilgrim Psalms (cxx.–cxxxiv.), the Hallelujah psalms (cxi. sqq., and cxlvi.–cl.), the royal psalms (xciii.–xcix.), and perhaps an independent Davidic collection—not to speak of other sources or aggregations—the collection which forms books four and five of the present Psalter. These three aggregations were then united, after an independent existence of uncertain duration, into one book, with Ps. i. or Pss. i.–ii. as preface, these two psalms together giving the two points of view of the whole Psalter, the Law, and the Messiah. If this view of the growth of the Psalter is correct, it follows that the division into five books is not of early origin, but came about in imitation of the fivefold division of the Torah or Law. The relative age of the individual selections and the origin of the Psalter as a whole can be ascertained with only approximation to certainty. Indications are found in the fact that in the first (and oldest) book there exist exilic and postexilic compositions; in other words, this was not collected before the time of Ezra. If there were preexilic psalms in greater number, they must either have existed in a special collection now lost, or they persisted as individual compositions until the collector of the first book included them in his aggregation.

2. The Process of Collection.

So far as the *terminus ad quem* is concerned, the translators of the Septuagint found the Psalter existing not in scattered aggregations but as a whole. Still, it is not possible to say when the translation into Greek was made, and thus no absolute date is attainable. William Robertson Smith thought to obtain indications from the history of the temple singers and of the personnel of the attendants of that institution. He rightly infers that the superscriptions to the Asaphic and Korahitic psalms are weighty evidences which indicate that these psalms were once a collection or hymn-book of a gild named after the master, whose concern was with the musical setting. Further evidence he thinks is found in the Chronicler's work, showing that in the latter's period there were three gilds of singers, those of Asaph, Heman, and Ethan (or Jeduthun), which were reckoned to the three great Levite families of Gerson, Kohath, and Merari. The Psalter is aware of Korah as a leader of a gild alongside of Asaph; but the Korahitic gild is believed by Smith to be one of doorkeepers in the Chronicler's time, while the Asaphic gild is carried by him back to the time of the return (Ezra x. 23–24; Neh. vii. 1, 73). So that the Asaphic and Korahitic psalms are to be placed earlier than the Chronicler and later than Nehemiah—between 430 and 300 B.C. Under Nehemiah Korah does not yet name a gild of singers; at the time of the Chronicler the gild has ceased to be such. On the other hand, a degradation of the Korahites is unlikely, since that period favored rather the elevation of the minor orders, and the retention of the Korah titles in the psalms speaks against it; though such degradation is not impossible under the influence of the story of Korah in the Pentateuch. The general situation in Chronicles does not permit of regarding the Asaphites as the one gild of singers, though they occupy the prominent place in the Chronicler's account; he knows also of the Korahites and Ethanites. The Korahites appear, however, as doorkeepers, but this is hardly to be thought of as the result of a degradation of the gild. The collections of the Asaphic and Korahitic hymn-books appear to have arisen, therefore, soon after 300 B.C. With this agrees the Elohistic character of those collections, thus comporting well with the same characteristic found in the Chronicler. From this same point of view would then be located the Elohistic Davidic collection, Pss. li.–lxxii. Of course this says nothing of the date of the individual psalms. In the time after the Chronicler and up to the period of the Septuagint and Sirach the Elohistic tendency was submerged; this accounts for the strongly Jehovistic character of books four and five.

3. The Date.

IV. The Ego of the Psalms: The question of the person speaking in the psalms takes its place in Old-Testament exegesis with the problem of the "I" of Job and of Deutero-Isaiah, and the tendency is to see in the pronoun a collective. It is natural to expect to see in this "I" the author, and in not a few cases this is unquestionably right. But in early times even there was a tendency to see in the pronoun not an individual but the community. Thus Theodore of Mopsuestia held that David had, in many psalms ascribed to him, entered into and expressed the soul of the people; and this opinion has at intervals since been several times repeated. The man of modern times who restated this proposition is Olshausen, who regards the "I" of many psalms to be the personified community, the expression of individual experience being taken

1. Varied Explanations.

as adequate for that of the people. But Olshausen was in this matter not with his times, and he found more opponents than supporters. Grätz attributed a great part of the Psalter to the circle of Levites which he names *Anawim*. He regarded Olshausen's theory as pointing in the right direction, since the Anawim spoke for their group, and in that sense for the entire people. But this idea found acceptance only in Jewish circles. Smend gave the idea once more a general currency, and found adherents for his view. The apparent agreement of the theory with the hypothesis of the late origin of the psalms is not hard to see. It sets forth an idea of the community in its dominating force as it first appeared in later times. Olshausen was wholly logical in pleading for a late origin of the Psalter; Smend's position had been prepared by the attribution of a large part of the Old Testament to postexilic times. This in turn led easily to the conception of the community as the speaking subject of the psalms. Smend's hypothesis was strongly supported by the musical titles prefixed to many of the psalms, and he came to the conclusion that "almost without exception the community speaks" in these compositions. He holds that a priori a psalm is an expression of the community; only under direct proof is a psalm to be considered the expression of an individual. Smend's conclusions nowhere found unconditional acceptance, and many scholars entered the lists against him.

2. Solution Independent of Age and Purpose.

The question of the speaker in the Psalter has generally been brought into connection with the two questions of the age of the Psalter and its relation to worship, and it has been mistakenly held that the answer to one of these furnishes the answer to the others; in fact, clarity is subserved when the questions are considered separately. The problem of the "I" of the Psalms has no necessary connection with their age, as is shown by the contrary answers given by Duhm; and, with limitations, the same is true of the matter of the relation to worship. The fact that the collection was made for public service gives an initial air of probability to the theory of a collective subject. An approach is made to a solution of the problem when it is considered that the Psalter is a composite made from very dissimilar elements. From what has previously been said, it is seen that a number of psalms were from the beginning designed for use in the Temple, and the probability is that the "we" in these designates the community, and that "I" is used in the sense of "we." This is analogous with the use of "thou" in the Pentateuch, where the individual is only apparently addressed, while the precepts are for the entire community. But alongside the group of which mention has just been made is another the psalms in which were clearly not designed in the making for public worship; and it is then apparent that there is a large number of psalms for which the only conclusion is that the author speaks as an individual. The fact that these can be universalized and fitted for general use does by no means involve that they were composed for collective use and in a collective sense. In more recent compositions of this sort it is true that a writer may work with the view of suiting his composition to the use of an aggregation of people, and his composition may none the less ring true, especially when the poet knows that his feelings are those of the people for whom he speaks. But where the general trend of life is individual, compositions of this sort are not the rule but the exception; and it is also a fact that a poetically endowed individual, at the moment when he expresses with emphasis the deepest experiences of his own soul, speaks of that which most intimately concerns himself alone. That what he says will fit other cases is not at the time within the range of consciousness. But just the literature which has arisen in this manner, expressing personal feeling and experience, has especial worth from the religious and ethical standpoint. Examples of this are Pss. xxxii., li., and lxxiii. The first is one of the most striking pictures in literature of the distress felt by a soul in dire need; while behind the idealism of the last is the ardent expression of one who feels that heaven, to say nothing of earthly joy, would have no worth were God not there. And these psalms gain in value when they appear as the personal expression of the situation and convictions of their author; if he spoke only of what was common experience and in the name of those whose hap was like his, something of worth seems to vanish from the psalms. On the other hand, if such experiences were general in early Israel, the intent to write for the people may be ascribed if only so the content is best explained. And after the time of Jeremiah such experiences were indeed the lot of the people. But there is a third group which deals not with the people as such, nor with the individual as such, but with a pious nucleus, the "poor," the "wretched," the "feeble," who appear as the upright and God-fearing and faithful. While it is not impossible that these designations should apply to the nation, when it is remembered that in Deutero-Isaiah this class does not constitute the whole people, that in many psalms this class is opposed to the godless in such a way that by the latter the heathen can not be meant, the conclusion of Grätz gains in probability that such psalms arose in this narrower circle which was oppressed by the godless and worldly and saw as imminent the judgment of God against their enemies. Psalms like xvi. and xxii. arose in this circle; the author himself may have been in mind or he may have considered the general situation in the manner in which the prophets viewed the characteristics of their times. Such an author was zealous for the law and foreshadowed the existence of the *Ḥasidhim* (the "pious") and the Pharisees before these parties as political opponents appeared on the scene.

V. Authorship and Date: Most of the psalms in their present form possess superscriptions which profess to give information regarding the author or the circumstances of composition. In many cases the word "of" is meant to indicate authorship, in other cases this meaning is questionable. The persons to whom this applies are David with seventy-three psalms, Solomon with two (lxxii. and cxxvii.), Moses with one (xc.), Asaph with twelve (l., lxxiii.–lxxxiii.), the Korahites with eleven (xlii., xliv.–xlix.,

lxxxiv–lxxxv., lxxxvii.–lxxxviii.), and Heman and Ethan with Pss. lxxxviii.–lxxxix. The historical value of these titles is now rightly in question. The condition of the text shows that the titles were not originally a part of the text, therefore not by the authors of the psalms, and that they are probably the work of the collectors and arose out of a late tradition and hence have but the value of an early supposition. Proofs are at hand. In the Hebrew text Pss. cxxii., cxxiv., cxxxi., cxxxiii., and cxxxviii. are ascribed to David, while some Jerome, or the Targum, or other witnesses regard as not Davidic; on the other hand, early testimony claims Ps. xxxiii. as Davidic while in the Hebrew text it is anonymous. This manifests a weakening of early tradition. In the Septuagint a number of psalms are ascribed to David which are not so ascribed in the Masoretic text, and Ps. cxxvii. is moreover ascribed to Solomon. This indicates that in the time of the Seventy there was working a tendency to increase the number of Davidic psalms, although there was also a tendency to deny the tradition which gave him certain others. The source of the first tendency may be found in the prominence occupied by David in the Messianic expectation of a later time. This went to its extreme in Rabbi Meir's claim of Davidic authorship for all psalms. The position arrived at by criticism of the text is confirmed by study of the contents compared with the titles. Without going into a minute investigation it is sufficient to note that of the seventy-three attributed to David by the Masoretic text a considerable number can not be his because the historic conditions presented point away from David's times, such as those which involve the existence of the Temple (v. 7, lxix. 9) or those which presuppose the exile (xiv. 7, li. 18–19). Pertinent is the fact that Asaph was a contemporary of David, yet the Asaphic psalms belong in large part to a late period. Of the attribution of psalms to David it is possible to give an explanation. Just as the psalms of the Korahites, a gild of singers, were attributed to their founder through the name of the collection being given to the individual psalms, so a collection named after David came to have its individual compositions called after the celebrated organizer of worship—possibly in the process of compilation into a larger collection. If this is the case, the superscriptions or titles often represent a tradition relatively late, sometimes oscillating and in many cases actually erroneous, perhaps sometimes arising through misunderstanding and consequently inconclusive. They may possibly point rightly to David as the author, but as evidence they are inadequate; only when title and internal evidence accord, or at least do not conflict, can the title play an important part.

1. The Titles.

In recent times the question of authorship has assumed an entirely different form. It is no longer, how many psalms are preexilic and how many must be postexilic? but, are there any preexilic psalms? And the next question is, necessarily, was there a preexilic religious body of lyrics in Israel, and had it any relation to the Psalter? The first answer must come from Ps. cxxxvii. 3–4, where it is clear that the "songs of Zion" are "Yahweh songs," presumably dealing with the relations of Yahweh and his people. A second piece of evidence is Amos v. 23, which unmistakably deals with songs of worship, showing that in the early prophetic days songs (psalms) to harp accompaniment belonged to the *essentia* of divine worship in the northern kingdom. Testimony is seen by some also in Lam. ii. 7. The force of these passages is disputed by William Robertson Smith, and perhaps rightly in the citation from Lamentations, on the ground that it deals not with official and regulated worship, but with the free spirit of worship by private individuals. But the passage in Amos, as evidently as Isa. i. 11 sqq., deals with the official worship for the benefit of the community. To be sure, Amos speaks of the service in the Northern kingdom; but it is not to be called in question that what was usual in divine service in the north was present in Jerusalem. The sanctuaries which were celebrated in the times of David and Solomon in all probability embodied the chief forms of worship customary at Jerusalem, and this is borne out by the already cited passage in Ps. cxxxvii. and by the lists in Ezra-Nehemiah of the returning gilds of Temple singers (Ezra ii. 41; Neh. vii. 44), mention of whom would be unintelligible if they had not in preexilic days had that position. Any other interpretation involves the strange hypothesis that the gild was modeled in exilic times after the Babylonian pattern. The conception of a preexilic Temple worship of song is the more reasonable since other themes had been richly treated in early times—one's memory lights upon David and Deborah—and undoubtedly song had been made a part of divine service (II Sam. vi. 5). It is therefore a priori probable that when Solomon made provision for worship in the new sanctuary, he included sacred song as a part of that worship, and Isa. xxx. 29 looks like the continuance of such an adjunct to divine service. The least that can be said is that song has a very close relationship to the cult of the period, as an essential part thereof.

2. Modern Phase of the Problem.

This does not, however, involve necessarily that psalms in the present Psalter are preexilic. It is possible that all trace of preexilic psalms is lost, that the present Psalter has in it only postexilic compositions. But it can not be said that it is a probability, in view of the evident presence of song in the Temple and in view of the strong tradition of David as a hymnist, that no single psalm survived the exile. And when the work of redaction is taken into account, and editorial changes of the text are considered, the improbability grows. Indeed many of the psalms, especially in the earlier parts of the Psalter, are best explained by referring them to Solomon's Temple (so the royal psalms xx., xxi., xlv.). With reference to Pss. xx. and xxi. it is to be remarked that only in preexilic times and after 105 B.C. did Israel possess a king, and it would take convincing evidence to refer a psalm to the later period. The exegesis which so relates them is forced not by the text but by a presupposition against their preexilic origin. Internal grounds

3. Are there Preexilic Psalms?

would lead to refer Pss. xx.–xxi. to the earlier period; while Ps. xlv. does not involve thought of a (heathen) Seleucid or Ptolemaic lord, and the rugged and primitive tone with the poetic strength bespeak an early age. Another class of psalms which point to a preexilic origin are those which question the worth of the institution of sacrifice. While in general in the Psalter Temple and sacrifice are highly esteemed, there are single psalms which echo the prophetic cry, "Obedience is better than sacrifice." They are an energetic protest against the idea of *opus operatum* in religion. Psalms which show this reforming spirit are xl., l.–li. It is not unthinkable, indeed, that in postexilic times, even during a postexilic nomism, a sort of undercurrent of prophetism came to the surface to oppose the legalism of the times. Perhaps this is the explanation of Ps. l.; and verses 20–21 look like the expression of an exilic or postexilic conviction, but this voice of protest interjected into the psalm bespeaks its existence before that time. But there is still another group of psalms which in form and content better fit the period of the kings and of the first Temple than of a later time (Pss. xix.*a*, xxix., xxxiv.*b*). So the majestic antiphony of xxiv. 7–10 brings before the eye the return of the ark, the old palladium of Israel, carried in triumphant return from a victorious war and with jubilant songs to its place on Zion. Similarly, in Ps. xix. 1–7, in a psalm of nature of unexampled beauty and sublimity, not only are the lordship of God and the glory and beauty of his creation celebrated, but the sun is pictured in a mythological fashion which, like the tone of Ps. xxix., carries back to early times and primitive conceptions. With this latter psalm should be compared the vision of Isa. vi. 1. When the originality and freshness of these compositions are taken into account, and also the poetic strength, it becomes difficult to attribute them to a late period.*

With the probability thus established that in the present Psalter there are elements from preexilic times, the next question is where the upper limit of time of composition must be set. Or, to put the question in another form, what is known of David as a psalmist? and are there any reasons to ascribe to him any part of the existent Psalter?

4. Indications of Davidic Authorship.

That David was a poet celebrating God's grace is generally recognized. As a master of song and of the harp he came to the court of Saul, and were nothing known of his compositions but the elegy on the death of Saul and Jonathan (II. Sam. i. 17 sqq.), his claim to be a master would have to be conceded. It is also known that he was a man of deeply religious character, and this fact even his own misdeeds and acts of tyranny or human weakness can not obliterate. That this religiousness was of a type different from that of later times is of course recognized. According to I Sam. xxvi. 19, he held that when he was driven into a heathen land he was obligated to serve the gods of that land; according to II Sam. xxi. 1 sqq., he yielded to a superstition and gave the heirs of Saul to the Gibeonites to be put to death; he wept and mourned during the sickness of his child in the attempt to swerve Yahweh from his purpose, but on the death of the child put away further mourning as useless (II Sam. xii. 22–23), and though the context shows his submission to the will of God, there is nothing which reminds of Ps. li. David's piety comes out in his relation to the Temple. The Chronicler ascribes to David the most complete preparations for its building, and this agrees with the interest in the establishment of divine service David showed from the beginning of his reign. This interest appeared in his removal of the ark from a lowly position to his capital with festal accompaniment, and with the view of furnishing for it a worthy abode. In thus transferring the ark, he laid aside his royal character and went as a simple servant of worship, thus earning the scorn of the haughty daughter of Saul. He showed himself ready to serve Yahweh to the utmost of his ability, and he assumed the functions of a sacrificer with the same purpose in view (II Sam. vi. 12 sqq.). If then David's piety does not take the form of later types, it yet shows an interest warmer and more personal; he is ready, in giving expression to his piety, to go to the verge of religious eccentricity. But the undeveloped and primitive type of his external manifestations of piety do not affect its essential character, though there may be present the same two-sidedness which he displayed as a man and a king. Given these characteristics in a man of his times, and the presumption is that the poet would also be in evidence; and the correct text of II Sam. vi. 5 shows that in David's time song was, at least on extraordinary occasions, an important element of religious worship. All probabilities are in favor of the supposition that David contributed to the development of this element. Viewed in this way the tradition of Davidic authorship, not especially forceful in itself, receives new light.

5. Explanation of Title "of David."

The superscription "of David" prefixed to many psalms may be due to a misunderstanding, and is to be traced perhaps to a book of psalms partly written and partly compiled by him and then supposedly extended to others brought into relation with him. But such a misunderstanding would be difficult to explain were there not a nucleus really in part composed by him, in part by him set to music. The attribution to David of seventy-three psalms can not be wholly without some historic basis. The inference naturally drawn from comparison of Ps. xviii., II Sam. xxii., and xxiii. 1 sqq., is sometimes without reason rejected on the ground that II Sam. xxi.–xxiv. was added in later times to connect the books of Samuel with the books of Kings. At any rate they were inserted by the redactor, who gives to four specimens of poetry David's name. Two of these are recognized as David's (II Sam. i. 17 sqq., iii. 33), two others are disputed (II Sam. xxii., xxiii. 1 sqq.). But had the redactor been concerned to make large claims for David, he could have attributed to him psalms

* In view of the existence of "originality and freshness" in so late a book as (e.g.) Jonah (cf. Driver, *Introduction*, 10th ed., p. 322), it seems hardly historical to imply that such qualities were totally and uniformly absent in later times. G. W. G.

which could have been inserted without difficulty in various places such as I Sam. xxvi.–xxvii., and II Sam. vii., xii., and xv. sqq. The fact that, according to the opposing argument, the redactor added only two pieces wrongly attributed to David speaks for his sobriety. As to the Davidic authorship of psalms in the present Psalter, there is no absolutely stringent proof that any particular one is his, since in no case is there absolute security that the superscription is correct. But the probability is great that such exist. Were there once Davidic psalms in greater numbers, some might have been forgotten, some worked over; but it is improbable that no trace of them would have been left. A hindrance to the recognition of Davidic psalms is the fact that to him were attributed psalms which smack of later thought and ideals. But if psalms are found having the characteristics of II Sam. i. 17 sqq., there is to be found the type attributable to him. By this test poems like Pss. iii., iv., viii., xviii.*a*, xxiv., xxix., and many others may be regarded as Davidic.

In answer to the question of the lower limits of psalm-composition it may be remarked that in early times Maccabean psalms were recognized. Thus Theodore of Mopsuestia [d. 428] placed seventeen psalms in that period, and Calvin also recognized Maccabean psalms. On the other hand,

6. Recognition of Late Psalms.

scholars like Gesenius, Ewald, Bleek, Hupfeld, and Dillmann controverted the position. The possibility and even the probability of the writing of psalms at that period must be admitted, the only question being how they could gain admission to the canon. So far as probability of composition is concerned, the late production of Daniel, Ecclesiasticus, and the Psalms of Solomon show literature still in course of composition down to the time of Pompey. In I Chron. xvi. 8–36 is a psalm which corresponds in part with Pss. cv.–cvi., and contains also the doxology of book four of the Psalter. This seems to show that the Chronicler (c. 300) already had the Psalter in practically its present form—at least so far as its division into five books is concerned. This does not preclude that individual psalms were added afterward, though hardly the majority of the present number. To the same conclusion points Ecclesiasticus, in its preface, when it speaks of the author knowing the law, prophets, and "other writings," that is, the threefold division of the canon. It is hardly likely that in the author's time Daniel was in the canon, though that the Psalter was there appears from the considerations just adduced from the Chronicler's narrative. Ecclus. xlvii. 8–10 seems to imply a Psalter, and yet psalms like xliv., lxxiv., lxxix., lxxxiii., and others appear to belong to this period and may have come into the canon as did Daniel.

Duhm has set a lower limit as late as 70 B.C. or even the year 1, thinking that the period of Aristobulus and Alexander Jannæus was fruitful in the composition of psalms; this brings us down to the period of the Psalms of Solomon. It is known that the later Hasmoneans discarded more and more the earlier theocratic ideals of the original Maccabean movement; they adopted heathen customs and acted as did other princes. This aroused the opposition of the Pharisees, but induced the support of the Sadducees. Out of this contest

7. Comparison with Psalms of Solomon.

arose the (Pharisaic) Psalms of Solomon, which regarded the conquest by Pompey as induced by Sadducean wickedness, led by the royal house. Now if canonical psalms arose out of this period, they should have the ring of the age of the Psalms of Solomon. This Duhm thinks he hears in psalms like ii., xviii., xx., xxi., xlv., and others, being the Sadducean compositions in praise of the king, while psalms like ix., x., xiv., lvi.–lviii. are the Pharisaic answers, which correspond in tone to the Psalms of Solomon. Now, that there are general similarities of thought in the canonical Psalter and in the Psalms of Solomon may be granted. But in their characteristics, especially in those characteristics which give ground for assigning to the collection a certain date, the latter stand by themselves and in distinction from the canonical psalms. Thus there is read in the Psalms of Solomon, i. 2, "Suddenly the alarm of war was heard before me"; i. 3, "their transgressions were greater than those of the heathen that were before them; the holy things of the Lord they utterly polluted"; ii. 15, (the daughter of Jerusalem was dishonored because)" she had defiled herself in unclean intercourse"; viii. 8 sqq., "in secret places beneath the earth were their iniquities, the son with the mother and the father with the daughter wrought confusion, they went up to the Lord's altar full of all uncleanness"; xvii. 5, "On account of our sins the godless (the Hasmoneans) rose against us, they laid waste the throne of David in their triumph"; xvii. 21, "from the ruler to the vilest they lived in their sin, the king a transgressor, the judge in disobedience, and the people in sin." This is the trend of the psalms which Duhm puts about the year 70, and such a trend is absent in the psalms selected by him as representative of the "Pharisaic" canonical psalms, which say nothing of the characteristic sins of the Hasmoneans. Where echoes of the canonical psalms appear in the pseudo-Solomonic book, the fact is due to following the model set in the canonical productions. This is exemplified in the patterning of Ps. Sol. xi. upon Isa. xl. sqq. There is further to be reckoned the inherent improbability of the inclusion of Sadducean psalms in praise of the hated Hasmoneans finding entrance into the canon, apart altogether from the difficulty of so many psalms getting in at all in so late a time.

VI. Theology: To speak in the strict sense of a theology of the Psalter is not permissible because of the fact that it is a collection covering centuries in time, the individual compositions coming from various circles, some written for use in the Temple, others for public or private use outside

1. Doctrine of God and of Righteousness.

of the established cultus, some speaking for the community at large, others expressing private and personal joy, grief, or pain, and still others representing a narrow community of the pious and pietistic. It is often difficult to classify particular psalms, let alone to express the general

sense of the whole. One must be prepared to find as various religious presentations as in general are found in the Old Testament itself. Eras like that of the times of the early kings, that of the prophetic teachings, and that of the reign of the law and dealing with sacrifice, find their representative expressions here. Alongside this is the fact that in any one period individual feelings find vent in different tones. If one selects the doctrine of God as the chief point of interest, one finds him spoken of as a war deity or a storm god (Pss. xviii., xxix., xxiv.), and as an eternal and omnipresent being (Pss. xc., cxxxix.); as the God whose dearest love is the broken and bruised heart, and as the one again who wishes no offering, or, once more, as the God who gave the law, meditation upon which day and night brings the highest praise to the pious (Pss. l., li., i.). Between these different conceptions lie centuries of development. Similarly if the test be the ideal of piety, of a religious and ethical ideal of life, the results show not only a varied expression but one which embodies diverse individual experience. In Ps. i. true piety consists in meditation on the law day and night; and since this psalm heads the Psalter, and, so to speak, sets forth the program of the collection, this ideal has been taken as that for which the Psalter stands. Such a tendency does, indeed, appear in the Psalter (Pss. xix. 7 sqq., cxix.), and sets forth the ideal of the learned in the law. Hand in hand with this ideal is that which expresses joy in the Temple, "A day in thy courts is better than a thousand." In the hours of celebration of the Temple services the pious experiences the blessing of mystic nearness to his God. Yet this latter ideal is older than that which finds essential piety in contemplation of the law. But one can not fit the whole Psalter into this measure. Psalms which express delight in the Temple and in sacrifice are offset by those which protest against an overvaluation of sacrifice and cult. Alongside of emphasis upon cult is found the simple ideal of a religious and ethical course of life (Ps. xxiv. 4).

With the ideals of piety and of a pure course of life goes step by step the consciousness of sin. In the Psalter may be found the confidence of a person in his own integrity and piety (Ps. xxvi. 11), or who hopes for salvation because of his rectitude (xxv. 21), or who speaks of sin from

2. Ideas of Sin and Eschatology.

the standpoint of ceremonial piety (xix. 12 sqq.). In Ps. xxv. 7, 18, the poet speaks almost vivaciously of his sins, but they are the sins of his youth for which he dares to bespeak forgiveness. He knows nothing of such a thought as that he is an unworthy servant, who after the Pauline type of expression is to be penitent and rely on faith (cf. also Ps. xix. 7 sqq.); two things alone can trouble him, ignorance and pride. But this is by no means the only view of piety found in the Psalter, as is seen on reading Pss. xxxii., li., which show not a superficial idea of sin, but a consciousness which is felt in the inmost self, which treat not of sacrifice, performance, or priests. Forgiveness of sin results from piety and righteousness—to the righteous only does it come, from it the wicked are excluded. Ps. li. makes forgiveness the correlative of renewal of heart, and reminds of the characteristic teaching of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. A similar state of things is found when one considers the eschatological and Messianic ideas. From the simple glorification of the king of Israel, who is exalted even by the heathen as God's son, is only a step to the thought that God will give the victory to his anointed on Zion over all his foes even to the end of the world. Such thoughts are in evidence in psalms like ii., cx., which reveal the trend of expectation during the historic kingdom. Similarly the beginnings of eschatology also reach back into early days, but it is continually unfolded, particularly after the exile. From the hope for the simple triumph of the king over his foes developed a transcendental expectation, assuming cosmical and eternal proportions. Indeed, the farther worldly expectations sank into the impossible, the more glowing became the hopes of a future glory, involving therein the world-judgment, after which was to come the kingdom of Yahweh, enduring forever (cf. Pss. i., v., vii., ix., xxii., xlvi., lxxxii., xcvii., and others). And a clear distinction is possible between the portrayal of the Messiah in the canonical psalms and in the Psalms of Solomon.

(R. KITTEL.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The books named under HEBREW LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE are to be noted for the poetry of the Psalms, and for introduction the works on Biblical introduction (Driver, König, Cornill, and others) and on O. T. theology (e.g., Schultz). Questions of introduction are generally treated with more or less fulness in the commentaries; special works are: C. Ehrt, *Abfassungszeit und Abschluss des Psalters, zur Prüfung der Frage nach Makkabäerpsalmen*, Leipsic, 1869; C. Bruston, *Du texte primitif des Psaumes*, Paris, 1873; J. F. Thrupp, *Introduction to Study and Use of the Psalms*, 2 vols., London, 1879; Messio, *De la chronologie des Psaumes*, Paris, 1886; J. Forbes, *The Book of Psalms*, Edinburgh, 1888; W. Alexander, *Witness of the Psalms to Christ and Christianity*, London, 1890; T. K. Cheyne, *The Book of Psalms*, ib. 1888; idem, *Origin and Religious Content of the Psalter*, ib. 1891; W. Stärk, in *ZATW*, xxii (1892), 91–151 (on the titles); W. T. Davison, *Praises of Israel*, London, 1893 (one of the "good little books"); W. T. Dawson, *The Praises of Israel*, ib. 1893; T. C. Murray, *Origin and Growth of the Psalms*, New York, 1894; Jakob, in *ZATW*, xxvi (1896), 265–291, xxvii (1897), 49–80, 263–279; J. K. Zenner, *Die Chorgesänge im . Psalmen*, Freiburg, 1896; H. Roy, *Die Volksgemeinde und die Gemeinde der Frommen im Psalter*, Gnadau, 1897; J. Köberle, *Die Tempelsänger im A. T.*, Erlangen, 1899; J. Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, vi. 163–187, Berlin, 1899; H. Grimme, *Psalmenprobleme*, Freiburg in Switzerland, 1902; Matthes, in *ZATW*. xxxii (1902), 65–82; J. Achelis, *Der religionsgeschichtliche Gehalt der Psalmen*, Berlin, 1904; F. W. Mozley, *Psalter of the Church; the Septuagint Psalms compared with the Hebrew*, New York, 1905; J. Gurnhill, *Companion to the Psalter*, 2d ed., ib. 1907; J. McNaugher, *The Psalms in Worship*, Pittsburg, 1907; J. W. Thirtle, *O. T Problems; critical Studies in the Psalms and Isaiah*, Oxford, 1907; F. A. Gasquet and E. Bishop, *The Bosworth Psalter*, New York, 1909; *DB*, iv. 145–162; *EB*, iii. 3921–67; *JE*, x. 241–250; Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire*, fasc. xxxiii. 803–838; *DCB*, ii. 450–455.

On the "I" of the Psalms consult: Smend, in *ZATW*. xviii (1888), 49–147; Schuurmanns-Steckhoven, in *ZATW*, xix (1889), 131 sqq.; G. Beer, *Individual- und Gemeindepsalmen*, Marburg, 1894; F. Coblenz, *Ueber das betende Ich in den Psalmen*, Frankfort, 1897; D. Leimdorfer, *Das Psalter-Ego*, ib. 1898; I. Engert, *Der betende Gerechte der Psalmen*, Würzburg, 1902.

Of commentaries the best is by C. A. and Emilie Grace Briggs, 2 vols., New York, 1906. Among the numerous others the following, devotional or critical, may be noted: J. Calvin, Eng. transl., 5 vols., Edinburgh, 1845–49; J. G. Vaihinger, Stuttgart, 1845; H. Olshausen, Königsberg, 1853; W. M. L. De Wette, Heidelberg, 1856; A. de Mes-

tral, 2 vols., Lausanne, 1856–61; P. Schegg, 3 vols., Munich, 1857; L. Reinke, *Die messianischen Psalmen*, 2 vols., Giessen, 1857–58; A. Tholuck, Gotha, 1873, Eng. transl. of earlier ed., Philadelphia, 1858; E. W. Hengstenherg, in Eng. transl., 3 vols., New York, 1860; J. M. Neale and R. F. Littledale, *Commentary . from the Primitive and Mediæval Writers*, 4 vols., London, 1860–1874; F. Hitzig, Leipsic, 1863 (one of the classics); W. S. Plumer, Philadelphia, 1867; C. H. Spurgeon, *Treasury of David*, 7 vols., London, 1870–85 (homiletical); J. A. Alexander, 2 vols., New York, 1873; J. G. Murphy, Andover, 1875; W. R. Burgess, 2 vols., London, 1879–82; A. R. Fausset, *Horæ psalmicæ*, ih. 1885; A. C. Jennings and W. H. Lowe, 2 vols., ib. 1885; G. H. A. Ewald, in Eng. transl., 2 vols., ih. 1880–81; D. Thomas, 3 vols., ih. 1882; H. Grätz, 2 vols., Breslau, 1882–83; J. J. S. Perowne, 2 vols., London, 1886; A. Coles, New York, 1887; F. Delitzsch, 3 vols., London, 1887–88; H. van Dyke, *The Story of the Psalms*, New York, 1887; H. Hupfeld, 3d ed. hy Nowack, Gotha, 1888 (one of the best); F. W. Schultz, Munich, 1888; W. P. Walsh, *The Voices of the Psalms*, London, 1890; J. Bachmann, Berlin, 1891; J. De Witt, New York, 1891; A. F. Kirkpatrick, in *Cambridge Bible*, 3 vols., 1891 sqq.; A. Maclaren, in *Expositor's Bible*, 2 vols., London, 1893–94; W K. Reischl, 2 vols., Regensburg, 1895; J. Sharpe, London, 1896; B. Duhm, Freihurg, 1899; C. G. Montefiore, London, 1901; A. F. Kirkpatrick, ib. 1902; F. Baethgen, Göttingen, 1904; T. K. Cheyne, *The Book of Psalms, or the Praises of Israel*, London, 1904; J. Wellhausen, in *SBOT;* L. Hulley, *Studies in the Book of Psalms*, New York, 1907; J. P. Peters, *Notes on Some Ritual Uses of the Psalms*, in *JBL*, xxix. 2 (1910), 113–125; W. O. E. Oesterley, *The Psalms in the Jewish Church*, London, 1910.

PSALMS, USE OF THE, IN WORSHIP. See PSALMODY.

PSELLUS, CONSTANTINUS (MICHAEL): Byzantine philosopher and theologian; b. either at Constantinople or Nicomedia 1018; place and date of death unknown. He received his early education from his mother, studied philosophy, and learned the rudiments of law from the later patriarch, Johannes Xiphilinos. For a time he practised law, then entered the public service under the Emperor Michael the Paphlagonian and, except for a brief period which he spent as monk on the Bithynian Olympus, remained in official life either as professor of philosophy in Constantinople or as imperial minister. He lived in the most corrupt time of the Byzantine court and is charged with ambition, vanity, and servility; but he was the most learned man of his time and one of the greatest of Byzantine scholars: His philosophical position as a student and admirer of Plato was not acceptable to the orthodoxy of his day; hence his permanent influence was hardly commensurate with his attainments or his great gifts.

Relatively few of Psellus' theological writings have been printed (cf. the collection in *MPG*, cxxii. 477–1186; and in K. Sathas, *Mesaiōnikē Bibliothēkē*, vols. iv.–v., Paris, 1874–76). They include an exposition of the Song of Solomon, which follows Gregory of Nyssa, Nilus, and Maximus, with original thoughts added in verse. A dialogue "On the Agency of Demons" (*MPG*, cxxii. 537–920) between a Thracian and "Timotheos" is the chief source of knowledge of the Thracian Euchites of the eleventh century. Certain memorial addresses—on Symeon Metaphrastes (*MPG*, cxiv.); on Gregory of Nyssa, Basil of Cæsarea, John Chrysostom, and Gregory Nazianzen; on the patriarchs Michael Cærularius, Konstantinos Lichudes, and Johannes Xiphilinos—are also important for church history. The "Various Teachings" is a compendium of theology and Christology, anthropology and ethics, with metaphysics, astronomy, and cosmology intermingled; as printed by Migne this work may be composite. The treatise "On the Definition of Death" and "What do the Greeks Believe about Demons?" approach the domain of philosophy, and the "Opinions about the Soul" and the commentary "On Plato's Generation of the Soul" are philosophical. A large number of spiritual discourses, observations on Old-Testament topics, on the Fathers, etc., is still in manuscript. Psellus also wrote poetry, sometimes in satirical vein which shows no respect for the Church. He was one of the first of the Byzantines to turn proverbs and popular sayings to moral instruction, and herein founded or refounded a special class of literature (cf. K. Krumbacher, *Mittelgriechische Sprichwörter*, Munich, 1893). Of his non-theological writings all that need be mentioned here are his *Chronographia*, comprising the years 976–1079 (published by J. B. Bury in his *Byzantine Texts*, London, 1899), and his numerous letters. (PHILIPP MEYER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, pp. 79–82, 433–444 (contains a very complete hihliography indispensahle to the student); Leo Allatius, *De Psellis et eorum scriptis*, Rome, 1634, reproduced in Fahricius-Harles, *Bibliotheca Græca*, x. 41–97, Hamhurg, 1804; F. Gregorovius, *Geschichte der Stadt Athen im Mittelalter*, i. 176–184, Stuttgart, 1889; K. Neumann, *Die Weltstellung des byzantinischen Reiches vor den Kreuzzügen*, Leipsic, 1894.

PSEUDEPIGRAPHA, OLD TESTAMENT.

I. Preliminary Discussion.
Name and Place in Study (§ 1).
Object and Character (§ 2).
Varied Interests Touched (§ 3).
Transmission (§ 4).
II. Poctic Pseudepigrapha.
1–3. The Psalms of Solomon, etc.
III. Prophetic Pseudepigrapha.
4. The Ethiopic Enoch.
Contents and Composition (§ 1).
Date (§ 2).
5. The Slavonic Enoch.
6. The Assumption of Moses.
7. II (IV) Ezra.
Texts, Editions, and Character (§ 1).
Contents and Date (§ 2).
8. V and VI Ezra.
9. The Logos of Ezra.
10–11. The Baruch Apocalypses.
12–21. Other Apocalypses.
22–23. Protoplasts and Twelve Patriarchs.
24–32. Other Testaments.
IV. Historical Pseudepigrapha.
33. Juhilees.
34. The Martyrdom of Isaiah.
35–41. Other Historical Pseudepigrapha.
V Philosophical Pseudepigrapha.

I. Preliminary Discussion: By Pseudepigrapha is commonly understood in the Protestant Church a series of writings having a Biblical cast of character which in some ecclesiastical regions have been held in more or less regard, but which, so far as is known, are not found in the manuscripts of the Greek Bible or in the Vulgate. "Pseudepigrapha" is not altogether a happy title, since in both canonical writings and in the Apocrypha there are books which bear a name not that of the author; yet since

pseudonymity is the chief external characteristic of these books, and is also that by which collectively they are best known, the title has won a certain right. By Old-Testament Pseudepigrapha are meant writings which, whether of Jewish or Christian authorship, are ostensibly by some personage belonging to the Old Testament or concern such a one; the name New-Testament Pseudepigrapha is kept for gospels, acts, epistles, and apocalypses which go under Christian names, otherwise called New-Testament Apocrypha. The study of the Pseudepigrapha was once left for those whose reputation was for the study of whatever was outré. Serious attention to them came first through the Tübingen school as a means to knowledge of the transition from Judaism to Christianity. After the work of Fabricius, Dillmann was the first to investigate them; Schürer has done notable work in vol. iii. of his well-known work; light has been thrown from the Assyriological side by Gunkel; and rays have come even from Persia and Egypt to illumine the subject.

1. Name and Place in Study.

These writings, so far as they are Jewish in origin, are a product of the late period in the development of that religion, partly belonging to 170–135 B.C. They have a polemic purpose against heathenism both within and without the Jewish fold, and the key word is separation from the Gentiles. On another side the purpose was a strongly framed Jewish propaganda. The writings constitute a national theodicy, the apotheosis of a Judaism that was hastening to its fall. Bound up with an inherent apology for Judaism was the intent to strengthen believers in their faith. Since the persecutions by the Greek overlord, the Jew had been prepared to suffer and to die for the Law which had been the ground of the persecution, expecting his reward in the blessedness of the final eon attained through resurrection. The chief concern of these writings is, therefore, revelation concerning this final state, and many of them bear the name apocalypse or revelation of the end. This is true whether the method is haggadic-midrashic or philosophic. In the eschatological treatment of the future the varied hopes of preexilic prophecy become magnified into gigantic illusion, furthered in part by the magnitude of the world powers concerned. While the predictions of Amos and his contemporaries seemed to have been ended by the exile, the hopes of the Deutero-Isaiah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Joel for a Jerusalem which was to be the world-city of the future were seized upon, and the thought of the times pictured a future beyond a final conflict which was to end the present age and usher in a new one born of heaven. This heaven, however, was not the old one, but a new and spiritualized one already foreshadowed in Isaiah xl. sqq. The world of the then present belonged to the heathen; God had given it up to angels to govern, and was permitting the evil to rule. This dualism was to come to an end in the final day, and Satan was to be shut up in hell; the kingdom of darkness was to give way to the kingdom of light. Then Israel was to come into its own as the dominant nation, though as a newborn Israel of such character that its triumph was to be that of the good over the bad. In some of the minor apocalypses alone did the preexistent Messiah figure; elsewhere God was in the foreground. In order to gain strength to endure the last period of distress, the reawakened hopes of Israel for a better world drew upon the most varied sources, including a mythological and esoteric philosophy of nature, by which to solve the riddle of the past and the future. As Saul sought the witch of Endor to read for him what the future held, so the new seers sought answer to their questioning even in heathen mantic. They underwent a course of discipline to gain the position of adepts in the unraveling of the future. The apocalyptic therefore takes on a half heathen, half monotheistic dress, and out of this come the imagery of beasts, and predictions made by means of secrets and riddles and numbers (see APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE, JEWISH). This apocalyptic became the new medium of the propaganda, the new wisdom. As a result, such literature as, e.g., the Book of Enoch, reads like a narrative of great wonders in nature and history, serving curiosity rather than edification. It satisfied, however, the taste of the times for the grotesque. But the form required was that of prophecy, and pseudonymity naturally took the form of apocalyptic. The new prophecy put on the mantle of the old in order to veil itself from the observation of the overlords. The names of Biblical heroes became the designation of communities of disciples, who probably revered saintwise the hero whose name they took. The past was portrayed in the dress of the future, and this feature is sometimes of value in determining the date of the writing. The seer receives readier credence because he is believed in his spiritual state to read the records in heaven, where all is recorded, and to traverse all space and all regions with angels as his guides. The apocalyptic of these writings assumes to be the successor of the earlier prophecy, continues the prediction of the final judgment and of the era of salvation in which this judgment issues, but with the added elements of the transcendental and the universal as constituents of the total presentation.

2. Object and Character.

The character of these books, therefore, makes them appeal to varied interests. They contain indications of facts in the realm of the history of culture and religion; they teach much concerning the character of later Judaism, supplementing the canonical writings of the Old Testament and revealing the receptivity exhibited by Jews toward ethnic influences in the period of the creation of these books; they bridge the gap between the Old Testament and the New, heralding the new ideas which appear in the latter. The ideas and imagery of the pseudepigraphic writings influenced not only the Christians of the first generations, but they continued to be reflected in the productions and thought-world of the Middle Ages. The profounder knowledge gained by the present age of the culture of the ancient East has shown that even the culture of the present is ringed about and conditioned by what appears in the writings under consideration;

3. Varied Interests Touched.

the distant past and the immediate present are linked indissolubly together. This apocalyptic speaks, moreover, not merely to the head, but also to the heart. Though modern science may smile at the pictures of heaven and earth here presented, the final victory of the good over the evil is a hope which has not yet ceased to echo in the breast. For the present generation, as for the people of that time, blessedness is a consummation to be attained under supermundane conditions—a hope that transcends reason.

The number of Jewish and Christian pseudepigraphic writings must once have been great. Jewish legend ascribes to Enoch no fewer than 366, the Mohammedan legend only thirty. The Apocalypse of Ezra (xiv. 6) tells of seventy secret books which are discriminated from the twenty-four canonical.

4. Transmission. At first sight, then, it seems strange that so few have survived, but history reveals the cause. Externally Judaism passed through two severe crises, those of 70 A.D. and 135 A.D., and the national-religious hopes of a Jewish hegemony over the nations embodied in these books vanished like a dream in view of the hard fact of defeat. But the surrender of these writings came the easier in that they, like the Septuagint version of the Scriptures, were employed apologetically by the Christian communities, and so the Hebrew originals were by their possessors allowed to disappear. The second cause of loss was the fact that to the philosophically trained Greek theologians of the Church the framework of oriental mythology which supported these writings was clearly apparent. From the centers of church life these writings were banned and found refuge apart from the main currents, in Abyssinia, Armenia, Arabia, and like places, where they have hardly yet ceased to inspire literary activity in similar channels (cf. *American Journal of Semitic Languages*, xix. 83 sqq.). For ease of discussion it will be well to divide the Pseudepigrapha into poetic, prophetic, historical, and philosophic writings.

II. Poetic Pseudepigrapha: 1-3. The Psalms of Solomon, etc.: The eighteen Psalms of Solomon which sometimes are found in manuscripts of the Septuagint and are reckoned among the *Antilegomena* (see Canon of Scripture, II., 7) or the Apocrypha, were first edited by the Jesuit De la Cerda in 1626, after which editions by Fabricius (1722), Hilgenfeld (1868–69), Geiger (1871), Fritzsche (1871), Wellhausen (transl., 1874), and Pick (Eng. transl., *Presbyterian Review*, 1883) were patterned. A new edition on critical principles was issued by Ryle and James (1891), Swete (in his ed. of the Septuagint, vol. iii., 1894), Von Gebhardt (*TU*, xiii. 2, 1895), and Kittel (1900). The psalms were originally in Hebrew, and were translated into Greek for the Greek-speaking Jewish diaspora. Solomonic authorship is excluded by internal evidence. Of the two hypotheses, that they were written in his name or were afterward given the name, the second is the more likely. The nucleus of the collection is traceable to the time of the overthrow of the Maccabean rule by Pompey, whose death in Egypt was known to the writer. Pompey is frequently referred to (xvii. 7, viii. 15, ii. 1–2, 26–27). The princes of the land (viii. 16–17, xviii. 12) are Aristobulus II. and Hyrcanus II. God has visited the Maccabees, the stealers of thrones and profaners of the temple, and with them their sinful supporters, the wise in counsel (i.e., the Sadducees; xvii. 8, viii. 11, 19). The opposite party, whose mouthpiece the psalmist is, are the Pharisees (ii. 4, 15 sqq., viii. 8 sqq., 23 sqq., xvii. 10, 15 sqq.). The opposition between the two sects runs through the psalms; the Sadducees appear as sinners, men-pleasers, surrounded by wealth and profaning the sanctuary (i. 4, 8–9, iv. 7–9, viii. 8–9, xii. 1 sqq.); while the Pharisees are innocent lambs, saints of God, the righteous and upright, and serve God and not men (iii. 3, v. 19, viii. 23, xiv. 1). The doctrine of God is lofty; his justice and righteousness are proclaimed, and only to the righteous does he grant eternal life (viii. 7, ii. 28 sqq., xiii. 11, xiv. 10). True regard for the law guarantees the safety of the righteous at the judgment (xiv. 2), and God will send his Messiah, David (xiv. 2, xviii. 5 sqq.). Then will sinners be smitten, the Jewish diaspora, united once more, will reign in Jerusalem, and blessed shall he be who lives in that day (xvii. 23–25, xviii. 6). While these indications suggest the period 65–40 B.C., and the psalms as a whole fit well with this date, attempts have been made to find other settings, as the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, or of Jason, or of Ptolemy in 320 B.C., or of Herod. **2.** Deserving mere mention is the Ps. cli. of the Septuagint. **3.** The Sibylline books are treated in a special article. **3a.** For the **Odes of Solomon**, see Solomon, Odes of.

III. Prophetic Pseudepigrapha: To be treated here are the apocalypses (nos. 4–21 below) and the testaments (nos. 22–32). **4. The Ethiopic Enoch:** The Book of Enoch, cited in Jude 14–15, known in whole or in part to the author of Jubilees and mentioned in the Apocalypses of Ezra and Baruch, enjoyed a popularity little less than canonical in the ancient Church until the time of Jerome, and even beyond that was treasured in the Greek, particularly the Alexandrian, Church. It came to the knowledge of European scholars in the eighteenth century, when in 1773 Bruce acquired three manuscripts from Abyssinia, and the *editio princeps* was published by Laurence in 1838. Important investigations have been made by Dillmann, Schodde, Charles, Beer, and Fleming. While the Ethiopic text is based upon a Greek original, the question of a Hebrew or Aramaic text back of this is still under debate. In its present form the book divides into three principal parts: an introduction on the imminent world-judgment, i.–v.; the body of the work, vi.–cv.; and the close, cvi.–cviii. The main part subdivides into several parts: (a) vi.–xxxvi., of which vi.–xi. tells of the fall of the angels and their preliminary and final punishment, xii.–xvi. of Enoch's vision and the first and second punishment of the angels and their progeny, xvii.–xxxvi. describes Enoch's travels in company with the angels; (b) xxxvii.–lxxi. is Messianic; the section xxxviii.–xliv. describes the celestial hierarchy, xlv.–lvii. the Messianic judgment, lviii.–lxix. the blessedness of the righteous in heaven, lxx.–lxxi. Enoch's

1. Contents and Composition.

translation and reception as son of man; (c) lxxii.–lxxxii. is "astronomical" and relates the dissolution of the universe in the final age and Enoch's return and earthly abiding; (d) lxxxiii.–xc. develops the history of Israel from Adam to the coming of the Messianic kingdom; (e) xci.–cv. contains varied admonitions and warnings. The book as a whole is a sort of natural and spiritual philosophy, a revelation of things secret, present and future, in nature and history, including the life and fortunes of Enoch. The book is a composite of pieces that have crystallized about the name of Enoch in which the periods of growth and the seams which unite them and even the raw edges are still visible. Thus to one composition belong vi.–xi., lx., lxv.–lxix. 25, cvi.–cvii., and other smaller sections, and even vi.–xi. is blended from two sources; and xvii.–xxxvi. is also capable of analysis, as is indicated by the double name of the Messiah. A new book is begun with xxxvii. 1, containing Enoch's genealogy as that of a person hitherto unknown, and the manner of introduction and character of the writing prove that the source was not oral but written, and in this part Enoch is characterized as "son of man." It further appears that the astronomical book is a conclusion to the travels, though not necessarily originally an organic part thereof. A good introduction is furnished by i.–v.; xii.–xvi. joins on suitably to the account of the fall and punishment of the angels; xvii.–lxxxii. gives the perspective for the predictions; and the warnings and exhortations come appropriately at the end. But that there are infelicities in the arrangement may be seen on comparing lxx.–lxxi. with lxxxi. 7. Two sets of traditions are present in the book, one an Enoch cycle, the other a Noah cycle, though literary analysis has not yet had its last word.

2. Date. Among the oldest strata must be placed the apocalypse of the ten weeks, xciii. 1–14, xci. 12–17, which, since there is no mention in it of the Maccabees, must date earlier than 167 B.C. Next earliest is the vision of the seventy shepherds; xc. 9 points to the Maccabees, the "great horn" being either Judas Maccabeus or John Hyrcanus, placing lxxxv.–xc. either before 160 or c. 135–130 B.C. The party strife revealed in cii.–ciii. and related parts is better referred to the period of Alexander Jannæus (104–78 B.C.) than to that of John Hyrcanus. The speculations on cosmogony and cosmology betray the influences of Greek and late oriental philosophy. To later strata belong xxxvii.–lxix., which follow the chronology not of the Samaritan Pentateuch but of the Septuagint. The Sadducees are referred to in xxxviii. 5, xlvi. 8, xlviii. 10, liii. 5–6. There is no clear trace of conflict with the Romans, and a time prior to 64 B.C. is indicated for the descriptive parts, and may not be referred to the time of Herod, nor can the Messianic passages be regarded as interpolations from Christian sources. The materials from the Noah cycle have to do mostly with angelology and cosmology, and it is noteworthy that a Noah source of similar purport was employed by Jubilees x. 13, xxi. 10. The place of redaction was probably northern Palestine, the hills of which suggested the imagery of the fall of the angels. It appears that the work as completed served the purpose of a reference book by which to answer problems arising concerning time and eternity—it was the apocalyptic Bible of Judaism in the time of Christ. No other apocalypse has so large a range; moreover, confidence in the coming world rule of the Jews is as yet unbroken, doubt as to salvation has not yet arisen, the final catastrophe—the destruction of Jerusalem—has not yet occurred. Psychologically, IV Ezra is a finer work, but its reach is less and its comprehensiveness more confined.

5. The Slavonic Enoch: This was published by Popow in 1880, in a shorter recension by Nowakowitch in 1884, by Charles and Morfill, Oxford, 1896, in German translation by Bonwetsch, Göttingen, 1896. The Slavonic is derived from a Greek text, and is not dependent upon the Ethiopic Enoch. Enoch's travels through the seven heavens are narrated in iv.–xxi., creation and history from Adam to the flood occupy xxii.–xxxviii., teaching and exhortation are found in xxxix.–lxvi.; Enoch's ascension is given in lxvii., and a review of his life in lxviii. The first part is in closest touch with the Ethiopian Enoch; the origin is Jewish, but the material was worked over by a Christian redactor. Reference to the Jewish sacrifices requires a date before 70 A.D.

6. The Assumption of Moses: This work was known from Origen's *De principiis* (III., ii. 1) as the source of the quotation in Jude 9. A large fragment was found by Ceriani in the Ambrosian Library at Milan in 1861 and by him published. It has since been published or translated by Hilgenfeld 1866, 1876, Volkmar 1867, Schmidt and Merx 1868, Fritzsche 1871, Charles 1897, and Clemen, in Kautzsch's *Apokryphen*, Tübingen, 1902. A Hebrew or Aramaic origin is probable. According to chap. i., Moses when 120 years old and in the year of the world 2500 gave this secret book to Joshua; it contains the story of Israel's experiences till the establishment of the Messianic kingdom (i.–x.), after which Israel was to undergo severe sufferings for its sins (xi.–xii.). The close of the book, including the Assumption of Moses and the part quoted by Jude, is lost. The tradition concerning the book discriminates between a Testament of Moses (which corresponds to the extant portion) and an *Analepsis Mouseos*, two names which correspond to the two parts of the book, the first of which is Ceriani's, while the second is extant only in patristic citations. In vi. 1 sqq. the Hasmoneans are referred to as the evil and blasphemous priest-kings. The king who follows them and reigns for thirty-four years is naturally Herod the Great. The mighty king of the West who sends his cohorts and general (Quintilius Varus) into Palestine is Augustus (vi. 8–9). But vi. 7 shows that the author must have written before the death of Philip and Antipas, and the time must have been soon after the death of Herod, though some have placed the book all the way down to 138 A.D. On account of his attacks upon Hasmoneans, the Herodians, and the Pharisees, the author has been taken for an Essene or a Zealot; but the recognition of the sacrifice in ii. 6, iv. 8, and the view of the future in chap. x. do not tally with Essenic notions, while the presentation of chap. ix. does not fit in with the teachings of the

Zealots. Others have seen in the author a Messianic pietist, or a pious and earnest nationalistic Jew, or a quietistic Pharisee—conceptions which are not very far apart, nor far from yet another hypothesis, that he was a Pharisaic quietist and rigorist. He was at any rate a close follower of the author of Daniel; Herod, the follower of the degenerate Hasmoneans, takes the place of Antiochus Epiphanes. He sees help in the immediate future, however; the godless rule is to be succeeded by a period of stress, and then comes the rule of God.

7. II (IV) Ezra: This name comes from the Latin, in which the canonical Ezra (Esdras) and Nehemiah are reckoned as I and II Ezra, and the apocryphal Ezra is III Ezra. The original name seems to have been " Ezra the Prophet " or " Apocalypse of Ezra." It is extant in Latin, Syriac, Ethiopic, Armenian, and two Arabic renderings. The corrupt Latin text was printed by Fabricius 1743, by Van der Blis 1839, by Volkmar 1863, by Hilgenfeld 1869, and by Fritzsche 1871, and it often appears in the Vulgate printed after the New Testament. A new text which supplies a large gap in the text as hitherto known was prepared by Bensly and published after his death by James, on the basis of Codex Sangermanensis and three other manuscripts (*TS*, iii. 2, 1895). This supersedes all previous texts. Under the name " Confession of Ezra " the section viii. 20–36 circulates as a separate piece and is found in independent translation and in copies. The Syriac was published in 1868 and 1883 by Ceriani, preceded by a Latin rendering in 1866. Laurence issued the Ethiopic in 1820 with a Latin and an English translation, and Dillmann published a critical text on the basis of newer material in 1894. A translation in English of one of the Arabic texts was issued by Ockley on the basis of Codex Bodleianus in 1711, an Arabic edition by Ewald appeared in 1863; he also made available the other Arabic text in part, though it was first issued in full by Gildemeister in 1877 after a Vatican manuscript. The Armenian was issued in the Armenian Bible of 1805, and is in the collection of Old-Testament Apocrypha issued by the Mechitarists in 1896. While these texts rest upon the Greek, it is evident from internal testimony that back of this lay a Hebrew original, which has been lost. The exceedingly abundant citations and references in patristic writings testify to the diffusion and popularity of the work in the early Church, a popularity which lasted down into the Middle Ages. The Latin is nearest to the original, after which follow the Syriac and Ethiopic. Renderings into modern languages by Volkmar 1863, Ewald 1862–63, Bissell 1880, Lupton 1888, and Zöckler 1891, are superseded by that of Gunkelchen, 1900. The occasion of the book was the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans (spoken of as Edom, iii. 15–16, vi. 7–10), and the purpose is to unroll a brighter future for the Jews. So Ezra, thirty years after the destruction of the city by the Chaldeans (the Romans), has seven visions. The first three are speculative, the next three eschatological, and in the seventh are found the close of Ezra's life and the genesis of the apocalypse.

1. Texts, Editions, and Character.

In the first three visions (iii. 1–ix. 25) the present calamity of Israel is a particular example of a more general disaster. Israel's misfortune is severer than its guilt, hence the mystery in the fact that those who are greater sinners oppress Israel (iii. 28, 31–32, v. 23 sqq.). The riddle is difficult, but reason is man's gift to employ, hence the attempt to solve it. The coming age will show that God loves his people (v. 33), and this age is near (iv. 44, v. 48); God himself is bringing the end when the Roman rule will cease (v. 3, vi. 6, 9) amid signs and wonders in heaven and earth, though but few will share in the results (vii. 45 sqq.). At the judgment sinners will be condemned, the judgment being one of righteousness and not of mercy (vii. 33 sqq.). The punishment of sinners is painted in fearsome colors. In the fourth vision (ix. 26–x. 59) is represented the expectation that Zion's time of sorrow is soon to be over, and then Jerusalem will be rebuilt. In the fifth vision (x. 60–xii. 50) is seen an eagle with twelve wings, three heads, and eight subordinate wings, which rises in the sea and flies over the land. After twelve wings and six subordinate wings have ruled and vanished and only one head and two wings are left, a lion comes out of the wood and pronounces judgment on the eagle. The eagle is the last of the four kingdoms of Dan. vii. In the sixth vision (xiii. 1–58) a man arises from the sea and flies with the clouds, and as men come to fight with him, he destroys them with flames from his mouth. The explanation shows that this man is God's son, the savior of the world, who restores the ten tribes to their home. In the seventh vision Ezra prepares for his end and dictates his visions for forty days in ninety-four books. The book is in dialogue, in which the angel Uriel is one of the speakers. Too little is known of the popular traditions to permit tracing the separate parts to their origins or to decide upon the interrelations. But the author evidently belonged among the patriotic visionaries. He holds that for the Jews was the world created, and that to them, as masters, must it come. The direr their present misfortunes, the greater the reward that shall be theirs. The difference between the author's utterances and those of Jeremiah in a like situation is vast. There are similarities between Ezra and Paul, yet for Ezra the interest is in the national theodicy and in Jewish apologetic, while Paul's desire is release from the power of sin. Paul represents the early prophets as a personal witness; Ezra covers himself under pseudonymity and takes refuge in occultism and esoterism. The date before which the book could not have been written is 70 A.D., since the author has outlived the fall of Jerusalem. A more exact dating is hard to discover. Wellhausen sees in v. 1–12 a suggestion of Neronic times, and in v. 8 a reference to the eruption of Vesuvius in 79 A.D. Others discern in this last only general apocalyptic features. But the book does not seem to have been written under the immediate influence of the fall of the capital, and a considerable period of subsequent misfortune seems to have been experienced, perhaps thirty years had elapsed (iii. 1). The eagle is quite certainly Rome. Possibly the first wing represents Cæsar, the second

2. Contents and Date.

Augustus; the troubles of the central period point then to the events after Nero's death; the three heads may be Vespasian, Titus, and Domitian. Other combinations have been worked out differing in details only from that just suggested. The date has been placed as early as 31 B.C. (Gutschmid) with Christian interpolations, and as late as 75–100 A.D. (Le Hir), with interpolations by Jews or Christians c. 218 A.D. The attempts made by Kabisch and De Faye to analyze the book into component sources fail in view of the general unity of coloring prevailing throughout. The place might be either Palestine—on account of the Hebrew language of the original—or Rome, where it might have issued from the diaspora (cf. iii. 2, 29, v. 17).

8. V and VI Ezra: Into the Christian Church the Jewish Ezra-Apocalypse came with many changes. Since the first Latin Bible of 1462, the book has been enlarged by two chapters prefixed and two added at the end, these being of Christian origin, the first section appearing both as IV Ezra i.–ii. and as V Ezra and the second as IV Ezra xv.–xvi. and as VI Ezra. At any rate these are to be distinguished both from the Apocalypse of Ezra and from each other. The first is complete in itself, and separates into two parts: (1) i. 5–ii. 9 is a threat against the early people of God, the Jews, who are rejected by God because of their unthankfulness; (2) ii. 10–47 consists of promises to the present people of God, the Christian, to whom the heavenly kingdom belongs. It was written in Greek, uses abundantly Old-Testament prophecy, is vigorous in style, and reminds one of Stephen's speech and of the Letter of Barnabas by its polemics. Its relations with the Shepherd of Hermas and with the Acts of Perpetua and Felicitas suggest the year 200 A.D. as the lowest date for its composition, and the West as the place. VI Ezra threatens the heathen (IV Ezra xv. 6–xvi. 35) and comforts Christians (xvi. 36–78) because the day of distress is near. The general tone implies Christian origin, reflects a persecution in the entire eastern half of the Roman empire, and suggests 120–300 as the date, and Asia Minor as the place of composition. **9. The Logos of Ezra:** Tischendorf published in his *Apocalypses Apocryphi* (Leipsic, 1866), pp. 24 sqq., a "Logos and Apocalypse of the Holy Ezra and of the Beloved God," a Christian apocalypse of very late date showing the inavertibility of divine judgment upon sinners and setting forth the impending punishments. Other apocalyptic literature under the name of Ezra is known, one concerning the sway of Islam (cf. Baethgen, *ZATW*, 1886).

10–11. Baruch Apocalypses: Besides the Apocryphal Baruch, a series of Jewish and Christian writings have appeared under the name of Baruch, the friend and helper of Jeremiah. **(10)** The best known and worthiest of these is that discovered by Ceriani in a Syriac manuscript of Milan and by him published in the original (*Monumenta sacra et profana*, 1871, and *Translatio Syra Pescitto*, iv. 257 sqq., 1883), and in Latin translation (*Monumenta sacra et profana*, i. 2, pp. 73 sqq., 1866). The letter of Baruch to the nine and a half tribes, standing at the end, was known earlier and printed in the Paris and London polyglots. A new English translation of the Apocalypse by Charles appeared in 1897, and one in German by Ryssel in 1900. The Syriac is from a Greek original of which xii. 1–xiii. 2 and xiii. 11–xiv. 3 were found by Grenfell and Hunt. The Greek goes back to a Hebrew original. In i.–v. it appears that in the twenty-fifth year of Jeconiah God announced to Baruch the imminent fall of Jerusalem. The next day the Chaldeans appear before the city, and angels have concealed the sacred vessels and destroyed the walls (vi.–viii.). Baruch fasts seven days and receives further revelations, and Jeremiah accompanies the captives to Babylon (ix.–xii.). After another fast Baruch learns that judgment awaits the heathen; Zion is thrown down that the world's end may the sooner come (xiii.–xx.). The first destruction of Jerusalem is to be followed by a second, which ushers in the time of blessedness (xxi.–xxxiv.). Then follows a series of visions, some of them preceded by fasts, in the first of which the Messiah appears and establishes his kingdom. One reveals the history of Israel from Adam on, the sea appears as of alternating dark and clear waters, each having its significance; and then come the two letters, one to the nine and a half tribes, the other to the two and a half (xxxv.–lxxvi., where the text breaks off). This book was written after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, as is shown by the characterization of the destroyers (as Chaldeans, a mask which the author employs) and by clear reference to the defilement of the temple by Pompey (the first destruction). Sections appear which seem to indicate for parts a date earlier than this, e.g., xxxix.–xl., lxix.–lxx. Relations exist between this book and IV Ezra; one must have used the other, though which is the earlier is doubtful, and the scholars are nearly equally divided upon the question. Other data for settling the time of composition than comparison with IV Ezra and the general historical background do not exist. While 70 A.D. is the *terminus a quo*, the apparent use of it by Papias in the depiction of the fruitfulness of the millennial kingdom fixes the *terminus ad quem*. The author was an adherent of Judaism, but his residence is not determinable. **(11)** A Greek Apocalypse of Baruch was discovered by Butler in a manuscript in the British Museum in 1897 and published by James (*TS*, v. 1), accompanied by an English translation of the Slavonic text by Morfill; German translation after James' text by Ryssel in Kautsch's *Apocrypha und Pseudepigrapha* (1900). The Slavonic text is an extract from the Greek, which is shorter than the original known to Origen —he speaks of seven heavens, the Greek has five, the Slavonic only two. It sets forth that Baruch, grieving over the fall of Jerusalem, is comforted by the promise that he shall learn deep secrets, and he journeys through the five heavens in company with an angel. The narrative reminds one of the Slavonic Enoch. The basis is Jewish, but there are Christian interpolations. Other Baruch literature exists, but of Christian origin, one writing picturing the fortunes of the Church, especially the Ethiopic Church; another is a Slavonic Vision of Baruch, and there is a Latin Apocalypse of Baruch.

12-21. Other Apocalypses: Nicephorus, Ambrosiaster, and Jerome mention (**12**) an Apocalypse of Elijah or a book of his, and Origen seems to make I Cor. ii. 9 a citation of it, though Jerome combats this, and he seems to refer it to an Ascension of Isaiah. A Hebrew Apocalypse of Elijah, placed by one editor in the post-Talmudic period and by another in the third century, was published by Jellinek in 1855 (Bet-ha Midrasch III., xvii. 65 sqq.) and by Buttenwieser in 1897 (**13**) The **Apocalypse of Zephaniah,** a work "of the Prophet Zephaniah," is mentioned by Nicephorus, and was known to Clement of Alexandria, who mentions it as containing both an "Ascension of Isaiah" and descriptions of a journey in the heavens and hells; the seer is caught up and led up through the various heavens, in the fifth of which he sees the angels called by him *kurioi*, "lords." Possibly to this Zephaniah apocalypse are to be traced a writing extant in two Coptic dialects, also two others mentioned by Steindorff (see BIBLIOGRAPHY) which deal with an establishment of a Messianic kingdom to last a thousand years upon a renewed earth. The unity of the first part (i.–xviii.) appears in the general relations. So the anonymous apocalypse of Steindorff and his fragment of a Zephaniah book together agree with the character of the apocalypse known to Clement of Alexandria. The second part, though it speaks of Elijah (in the third person), is not really an Elijah apocalypse, and goes well with the first part to complete a Zephaniah apocalypse. The whole is either a Christian work or a Jewish production worked over by a Christian, and in its present form is probably later than Clement of Alexandria, possibly of the second half of the third century. (**14**) From an **Apocalypse of Jeremiah** Jerome derives Matt. xxvii. 9, while Origen ascribes it to a *Secreta Eliæ*. The Coptic Bible contains a short prophecy ostensibly by Jeremiah. Eph. v. 14 is by Epiphanius attributed to an Apocalypse of Elijah, but others—e.g., Euthalius and Syncellus—ascribe it to an *Apocryphon Jeremiæ*. (**15**) An **Apocalypse of Zachariah** is named by Nicephorus, a Christian writing based on Luke i. 67. (**16-18**) Nicephorus speaks also of a Habakkuk writing, one of Ezekiel, and one of Daniel. (**19**) An **Apocalypse of Moses** is named by Syncellus as the basis of Gal. v. 6, vi. 15. (**20**) In the anonymous list of canonical books a writing of Lamech finds mention. (**21**) Nicephorus speaks of a writing of Abraham, possibly the Slavonic **Apocalypse of Abraham** published by Bonwetsch in German in 1897, in which Abraham is taught by an angel to offer an acceptable sacrifice, is taken to heaven and there receives revelations regarding the history of his people. It is of Jewish origin, is used by the Clementine Recognitions, before which therefore it was composed. Possibly to be distinguished from this is the book of the same name used by the Sethite Gnostics (Epiphanius, *Hær.*, xxxix. 5), possibly the *Inquisitio Abrahamæ* of Nicetas; also the Testament of Abraham published by James in 1892 (*TS*, ii. 2) and by Bassilyew in 1893 (*Anecdota Græco-Byzantina*, i.) in Greek, English in *ANF*, of which Slavonic, Rumanian, Ethiopic, and Arabic versions are extant.

22-23. Protoplasts and Twelve Patriarchs: Anastasius Sinaita makes mention of a (**22**) **Testament of the Protoplasts** which said that Adam on the fortieth day after his creation went to Paradise. This report is in both the Book of Jubilees and in the Book of Adam and Eve. (**23**) The **Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs** is cited by Origen, is probably referred to in Nicephorus and the synopsis of Athanasius. The Greek text was edited by Grabe, 1698, 1714, repeated by Fabricius 1713, Gallandi 1788, and Migne 1857; comparative edition by Sinker 1869, 1879, critical edition by Charles, London, 1908, also English translation of the same. The book is known in Old Slavonic, Armenian, and Latin versions. The contents are in substance the history told by each of the morbescent patriarchs to their descendants, with warnings and exhortations which fit with the character of the person speaking, and are drawn from the personal experience of the speaker as revealed in the Old Testament. With curious unanimity nearly all the patriarchs speak of the leadership of Judah and Levi. There seems to be a reference to Christ as savior, and one to Paul as the apostle to the heathen; consequently, since 1810 it has been customary to attribute this work to a Christian, the only controversy being over the type of Christianity represented. The author has been called an Essene, an Ebionite, a Nazarene, a Pauline Christian, and so on. But the work has a ground work of Jewish provenance; the Christian references are interpolations. While special emphasis is not laid upon the Law, and when spoken of it is rather as morals than as ritual, yet the development is in general such as would interest only a Jew. The Christian interpolations, on the other hand, are very definite, and the Christology is patripassian. There appear, however, at least two strata of these interpolations, and the Jewish basis is not a unit, traces of a double recension appearing. The work had probably a long history in the synagogue before it came into the possession of the Church. The time of composition is indicated by portions which are closely parallel with passages in the Book of Jubilees. The earlier author is clearly a partizan and adherent of the Maccabean house, especially in its phase of priest-princes, on account of which it of right rules the other tribes, as well as because of its success in its conflicts with the heathen in which it won religious and political liberty. Other parts show as clearly the breach between the Hasmoneans and the Pious—thus the stock of Levi has through its wickedness led astray the whole of Israel (Testament of Levi, xiv. sqq.). The times of Aristobulus II. and of Hyrcanus II. are clearly referred to. The love for the Maccabees which in some parts of the book shines out has in others turned to hate. Thus it appears that the origin of the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs must be placed along the way from c. 166 to 64 B.C. For the Christian interpolations therein the *terminus ad quem* is Irenæus, to whom the reference to Christ as sprung from the tribes of Judah and Levi was known.

24-32. Other Testaments: Only the title is known of (**24**) a book **Of the Three Patriarchs.** (**25**) On a Coptic **Testament of Abraham** cf. I.

Guidi, *Il testo copto del Test. di Abramo* (Rome, 1900). (26) There is a **Testament of Jacob** named in the *Decretum Gelasii*, and a **Testament of Isaac and Jacob** is known. The *Proseuchē Ioseph*, **Prayer or Blessing of Joseph,** containing some 1,100 stichoi, spoken of by Origen and Michael Glykas, is possibly the same as the " words of Joseph the upright " of the Ascension of Isaiah, iv. 22, to which some see reference in Ecclus. xlix. 12. (27) The **Testament of Moses** named by Nicephorus, Pseudo-Athanasius, and elsewhere may be the same as Jubilees (no. 33 below); though if the number of stichoi is correctly given as 1,100, this supposition can hardly be sustained. (28) A **Testament of Ezekiel** appears in the Martyrdom of Isaiah (no. 34 below). (29) For the **Testament of Adam and Noah** see no. 39 below. (30) In the Acts of the Council of Nicæa appears a **Book of the Mystic Words of Moses,** of which nothing further is known. (31) On the **Book of Eldad and Modad** cf. G. Beer in *Monatschrift für Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, 1857, pp. 346 sqq. It is named in the Shepherd of Hermas, *Vision*, ii. 3. (32) On the **Testament of Job,** related to the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, cf. James, *Apocrypha Anecdota*, v. 1, in *TS*, 1897, pp. lxx. sqq., 103 sqq., and Conybeare in *JQR*, 1900, pp. 111 sqq.

IV. Historical Pseudepigrapha: These are the product for the most part of the Hellenistic Jews who busied themselves in the second and first centuries before Christ in narrating and adorning the Biblical stories as a part of their propaganda.

33. Jubilees: For the patriarchal history Epiphanius, many of the Byzantine writers, and others relied upon a book cited as Jubilees, Little Genesis, and under like titles. Either a like work, or one excerpted from this, was known as the Apocalypse of Moses, the Life of Adam, the Testament of Moses, or Book of the Daughters of Adam. In the thirteenth century it was lost to knowledge, and reappeared in the middle of the last century in an Ethiopic " Book of Jubilees," published first by Dillmann from two manuscripts in 1859, by Schodde in translation (Oberlin, 1888), by Charles from four manuscripts in 1895, in translation in 1902 from further material, and by Littmann in 1900 (in Kautzsch, *Apokryphen*). Ceriani discovered fragments of a Latin translation containing about one-third of the matter in the Ethiopic text in a manuscript in the Ambrosian library in Milan, which he published in 1861; Rönsch edited them in 1874 and Charles in 1895. There are indications of a Syriac translation, though whether of excerpts or of the whole is not decided. The Ethiopic text goes back to a Greek version, which is derived from a Hebrew, as is shown by the traces of plays on words which require for explanation a Hebrew (not an Aramaic) original (cf. iv. 15, 28). Tendencies to a use of New Hebrew are shown in the use of Mastema for Satan (e.g., in x. 8). On the whole, the Ethiopic text is reliable and in good condition, though gaps, probably having a purpose or " tendency," are indicated. The contents run parallel to Biblical history from the creation to the institution of the Passover (Gen. i.–Ex. xii.). A very definite chronology is involved, the whole period from the creation till the entrance into Canaan being arranged in fifty jubilee periods of forty-nine years each (2,450 years). Each event is located with reference to this chronological scheme. The text of Genesis is employed in the manner of midrash, the narrative embellished, the text itself sometimes suppressed or altered to fit the needs of the author. The spirit of the priestly writer is intensified. Thus the Sabbath was not an institution begun at creation, but was observed by God and the archangels; circumcision was not begun with Abraham, the angels employed it; the entire Mosaic law is but the replica of an eternal exemplar. Even the tabernacle existed in heaven. Similarly, the weaknesses of the patriarchs are glossed, and what to the advanced sense seemed bad theology underwent change. Abraham's statement about Sarah is suppressed, the temptation of Abraham proceeded not from God but from Mastema (Satan), and Jacob was never tricky nor unrighteous. The advantages accruing to the chosen people are set in high lights. The isolation of Israel from the heathen is emphasized—the heathen are the inheritance of Israel, and whoever gives his daughter to a Gentile gives her to Moloch. Jubilees assumes to be derived from Moses, an esoteric work, which includes esoteric material communicated by the patriarchs from Enoch by way of Methusaleh, Lamech, Noah, Shem, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph. So that it may be described as a haggadic-halachic supplement to the Torah from a Levitical-apologetic standpoint. The background of Jubilees is a period when the religious and national peculiarities of Israel were in danger of extinction from foreign culture—i.e., between 200–160 B.C. It reflects the emphasis laid upon the Sabbath and circumcision through the attempts of Antiochus Epiphanes to abolish those institutions. Of like purport is the stress laid upon avoidance of marriage with Gentiles and even of eating with them; and also the suggestion of abstention from the games of the stadium. The victorious career of the Maccabees lies behind the history as reflected in the victory of Jacob and his sons over the Amorites (xxix. 10–11, xxxiv. 1 sqq.), and the victories of John Hyrcanus over the Edomites also are past, while Herod has not yet come to the throne. The high-priestly functions assumed by the Maccabean house are present realities, regarded as legitimate permanencies. The author appears as a Pharisee of the straitest sect, yet as an ardent believer in the Maccabean leadership. The time of the composition therefore seems to be the middle period of the reign of John Hyrcanus. The program of the author seems to be a sanctioning of the Pharisaic idea of government by and through the Maccabeans. While the period of the reign of Alexandra, which has been proposed, would in some respects fit the circumstances, there is no hint of the breach between the Pharisees and the Maccabees which immediately preceded that reign. There is little to support the supposition that the author has used the visions of the Ethiopic Enoch and that therefore a time in the reign of Herod is to be assigned for the composition of Jubilees.

34. The Martyrdom of Isaiah. Origen frequently mentions an apocryphal Jewish writing in which

the martyrdom of Isaiah is recounted; Epiphanius and Jerome speak of an Ascension of Isaiah; the Montfauçon Canon cites a *Horasis Hesaiou*, known in the eleventh century to Euthymius Zigabenus; in the beginning of the twelfth century Georgius Cedrenus mentions a Testament of Ezekiel; Sixtus Senensis in 1566 speaks of a Latin translation of a Vision of Isaiah printed at Venice in 1522 (rediscovered by Gieseler and published in 1832). In 1828 Mai published two fragments of an Old Latin translation of the Ascension (*Nova collectio*, iii. 2, pp. 238–239). In 1819 light was thrown upon the Isaianic work current under various names by the publication by Laurence of an Ascension of Isaiah from an Ethiopic manuscript; Gfrörer reissued Laurence's Latin translation in 1840; Dillmann issued a critical edition of the Ethiopic with Latin translation in 1877; and Charles edited in 1900 the Ethiopic and the Latin texts, using Bonwetsch's Latin translation of a Slavonic version of the Vision and the large Greek fragment of Grenfell and Hunt (which they published in *Amherst Papyri*, part i., 1900). The work contains a prediction by Isaiah in the twenty-sixth year of Hezekiah of the godlessness of Manasseh's reign (chap. i.); after Hezekiah's death Manasseh devotes himself to the service of Satan, and Isaiah flees into the solitude (ii.); a certain Belchira accuses Isaiah to Manasseh of agitating against king and people, stirred to this by Satan, who hates Isaiah because of his prophecy of salvation through the Messiah (iii. 1–iv. 22); Manasseh has Isaiah sawn asunder (v.); in the twentieth year of Hezekiah Isaiah has a vision in which an angel leads him to the seventh heaven, where he learns that Christ is to descend to earth; he is then led back to the firmament where he beholds the story of Jesus from his birth till his ascension, when the angel returns to heaven and Isaiah to his earthly life (vi.–xi.). The book has arisen from uniting two entirely discrete compositions, one purely Jewish which relates the martyr death of Isaiah under Manasseh, the other a purely Christian ascension or vision; to these were added two other pieces as introduction and conclusion, together with shorter pieces which were interpolated, part of them corresponding to the Testament of Ezekiel mentioned by Cedrenus (ut sup.). The legends of the martyrdom of Isaiah, probably influenced by Iranian legendary elements, were possibly known in writing to the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews (xi. 37) and to Justin Martyr (*Trypho*, cxx.); and this gives the *terminus ad quem* for at least a part of the book. The *terminus a quo* can not be determined, but the origin is connected at least with II Kings xxi. 16, and the development belongs with the midrash on the prophets, which continued to unfold with such exuberance in the early and middle church periods, furnishing stimulus to fidelity in times of persecution. From a historic standpoint the Christian part is more illuminating than the Jewish, connecting as it does with gnostic and docetic views in the early Church (cf. xi. 2 sqq.). Here the oldest part appears to be the closing section, which gave the name to the entire book. In another part are reflected the bad shepherds and false prophets of the Christian communities of the early second century (iii. 13 sqq.; cf. the Shepherd of Hermas and the Didache). The disorganized condition of the communities appears to the author as a sign of the end.

35–41. Other Historical Pseudepigrapha: To be mentioned first is (**35**) **Paralipomena Jeremiæ.** The kernel of this book, interpolated by Christians and Jews, is found in the Abyssinian Bible with the double title *Reliquiæ verborum Baruch* and *Reliquiæ verborum Jeremiæ*, put with the other Baruch and Jeremianic writings. It exists in Ethiopic, Greek (*Menæum Græcorum*), Armenian, and Slavonic. It begins, like the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch, with the days before the capture of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans and the securing by Jeremiah of the temple furnishings. Baruch stays in Jerusalem, Jeremiah goes to Babylon. Abimelech, sent by Jeremiah to the vineyard of Agrippa for figs, falls asleep and wakes up sixty-six years later, returns to the city, finds all changed, seeks Baruch, who is ordered to write Jeremiah a letter to the effect that if the people separates itself from the heathen, it shall be led back to the city. An eagle carries the letter to Jeremiah, together with the figs which are still fresh, and Jeremiah leads the people back. Jews who have brought along Babylonian wives are not admitted to the city; they then found Samaria. Jeremiah falls as dead in the city, revives after three days and praises God for salvation in Christ, and the people stone him to death for his prophecy. The *terminus a quo* is determined by the use of the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch; the *terminus ad quem* is possibly the first decade of the second century. (**36**) The book **Joseph and Asenath,** belonging to the midrashic propaganda against mixed marriages, employs the romance, widely diffused, that Asenath became the wife of Joseph after eating with him the "blessed bread of life," drinking a "potion of immortality," and being anointed with the "oil of incorruption." A book dealing with the contest between Moses on the one side and the Egyptian sorcerers (**37**) **Jannes and Jambres** (cf. Ex. vii. 8 sqq.; II Tim. iii. 8) is mentioned by Origen (on Matt. xxiii. 37, xxvii. 9) and is compared by Schürer with the "Penitence of Jamnes and Mambres" of the *Decretum Gelasii*. Pliny (*Hist. nat.*, XXX., i. 11) knows of a book under the name of Jannes, which may therefore go back to pre-Christian times. A book other than the Prayer of Manasses (cf. Apocrypha, A, IV., 4) was known in Jewish circles under a title like (**38**) **"The Conversion of Manasseh"** (cf. Fabricius, *Codex pseudepigraphus Veteris Testamenti*, i. 1100–02). (**39**) The **Books of Adam** are of interest in that they deal with speculation regarding original man; the Genesis narrative is fused with foreign sources. A Jewish Book of Adam is known to the Talmud, and an apocryphal Adam is known to the Apostolic Constitutions (vi. 16). A haggada, originally Jewish but worked over by a Christian, exists under the misleading title **"Apocalypse of Moses,"** published by Tischendorf in 1866, by Ceriani in 1868, and in a Latin *Vita Adæ et Evæ* (published by Meyer, 1878), which goes back to a Greek original. The two texts, found in Kautzsch's *Pseudepigrapha*, correspond in part verbally, but each has sections not found in the other. An Ar-

monian version, depending on a Greek text (which, however, is not original), was given in English translation by Conybeare in 1895. The *Spelunca thesaurorum* published by Bezold in Syriac and German in 1883–88 is enlarged in a *Vita Adami* published by Trumpp in 1880 from the Ethiopic, while the first part of the *Vita Adami* is from the *Hexaëmeron* published by Trumpp in 1882. In the closest connection with this circle is the **Testament of Adam** (Syriac and French by Renan, 1853; Greek fragment by James, 1893). The Gnostic Sethites had very early an **Apocalypse of Adam**, and other Gnostics a **Gospel of Eve. A Pœnitentiæ Adæ** is condemned in the *Decretum Gelasii*, and a "Life of Adam" is cited by Syncellus. A Gnostic writing entitled (**40**) **Noria** (wife of Noah) is cited by Epiphanius (*Hær.*, xxvi. 1), who names also a **Descent of Jacob** (Gen. xxviii.) in *Hær.*, xxx. 16. For the (**41**) **Letter of Aristeas** see ARISTEAS.

V. Philosophical Pseudepigrapha: Mention may be made of (**42**) IV Maccabees or "The Supremacy of Reason," which was falsely attributed to Josephus. The book is based upon II Macc. vi. 18–vii. 42. For the literature of sorcery cf. Schürer, *Geschichte*, iii. 294 sqq., Eng. transl., II., iii. 151 sqq. A review of the later Jewish eschatological literature is afforded by Buttenwieser, *Outline of the Neo-Hebraic Apocalyptic Literature*, 1901. Much will be added to the knowledge of early Christianity when a more systematic investigation has been carried through not only of the contemporaneous pseudepigraphic Jewish literature, but also of the Talmud and of Jewish and even Mohammedan legend and indeed of the "new-oriental" body of literature. (G. BEER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Collections and translations are: J. A. Fabricius, *Codex pseudepigraphus Veteris Testamenti*, vols. i.–ii., Hamburg, 1722–23; A. F. Gfrörer, *Prophetæ veteres pseudepigraphi*, Stuttgart, 1840; Migne, *Dictionnaire des apocryphes*, Paris, 1856; A. Hilgenfeld, *Messias Judæorum*, Leipsic, 1869; O. F. Fritzsche, *Libri apocryphi*, ib. 1871; O. Zöckler, *Die Apokryphen nebst einem Anhang über die Pseudepigraphenlitteratur*, Munich, 1891; J. Winter and A. Wünsche, *Die jüdische Litteratur seit Abschluss des Kanons*, vol. i., Berlin, 1894; E. Kautzsch, *Die Apocryphen und Pseudepigraphen des A. T.*, Tübingen, 1900; the *Uncanonical Writings of the Old Testament found in the Armenian MSS. of the Library of St. Lazarus*, Eng. transl. by J. Issaverdens, Venice, 1901 (contains the Book of Adam, History of Assenath, History of Moses, Deaths of the Prophets, Concerning King Solomon, History of Prophet Elias, History of the Prophet Jeremiah, Vision of Enoch, Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, III Esdras, and other fragments).

Discussions introductory and explanatory will be found in *DB*, i. 109–110; *EB*, i. 213–250; Schürer, *Geschichte*, vol. iii., Eng. transl., II., iii. 1–250; *JE*, i. 669–685; E. Reuss, *Geschichte der heiligen Schriften des A. T.*, Brunswick, 1890; W. J. Deane, *Pseudepigrapha*, Edinburgh, 1891; J. E. H. Thomson, *Books which Influenced our Lord and his Apostles*, ib. 1891; E. de Faye, *Les Apocalypses juives*, Paris, 1892; and the works on O. T. introduction by König, Bonn, 1893, H. L. Strack, Munich, 1895, and C. Cornill, Tübingen, 1905, Eng. transl., London, 1907. Further illustrative material will be found in A. Hilgenfeld, *Die jüdische Apocalyptic*, Jena, 1857; J. Langen, *Das Judenthum in Palästina zur Zeit Christi*, Freiburg, 1866; A. Hausrath, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, Heidelberg, 1873; M. Vernes, *Hist. des idées messianiques*, Paris, 1874; J. Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah*, London, 1877; H. Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos*, Göttingen, 1895; O. Holtzmann, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, Freiburg, 1895; W. Bossuet, *Antichrist*, Göttingen, 1895; idem, *Die Religion des Judentums*, Berlin, 1903; E. Hühn, *Die messianischen Weissagungen des jüdischen Volkes*, Tübingen, 1899; Schrader, *KAT;* P. Volz, *Jüdische Eschatologie von Daniel bis Akiba*, Tübingen, 1903; W. Baldensperger, *Die messianischen apokalyptischen Hoffnungen des Judentums*, Strasburg, 1903; M. Friedländer, *Geschichte der jüdische Apologetik*, Berlin, 1903; L. Conrad, *Die religiösen und sittlichen Anschauungen der Pseudepigraphen*, Gütersloh, 1907; *DCB*, iv. 506–510.

On the **Psalms of Solomon** the one book for the English reader is the ed. of Ryle and James, Cambridge, 1891, which gives the earlier literature. Further consult A. Carrière, *De psalterio Salomonis*, Strasburg, 1870; Vernes, ut sup., pp. 121–139; J. Wellhausen, *Pharisäer und Sadducäer*, pp. 112–164, Greifswald, 1874; Drummond, ut sup., pp. 133–142; P E. Lucius, *Der Essenismus*, pp. 119–121, Strasburg, 1881; Deane, ut sup., pp. 25–48; J. Girbal, *Essai sur les psaumes de Solomon*, Toulouse, 1887; Thomson, ut sup., pp. 268–296, 423–432; E. Jacquier, in *L'Université catholique*, new series, xii (1893), 94–131, 251–275; Levi, in *REJ*, xxxii (1896), 161–178; W. Frankenburg, *Die Datierung der Psalmen Salomos*, Giessen, 1896.

For the **Ethiopic Enoch** the one edition is that of Charles, Oxford, 1906 (gives the Greek text, the Ethiopic from the use of twenty-three manuscripts, and the Latin fragments; a new translation is promised). The Greek fragments from Akhmim were published by Lods in *Mémoires publiés par les membres de la mission française au Caire*, ix. 1, 3, 1892–93; by Lods, *Le Livre d'Hénoch fragments découverts*, Paris, 1892; by Swete in his ed. of the Septuagint, iii. 789 sqq., 1899. The Latin fragment is in *TS*, ii. 3 (1893). English translations are by Laurence, London, 1821; Schodde, Andover, 1882; and Charles, Oxford, 1893. The best discussion is by Charles in his edition of the text. Descriptions of the material and ideas may be found in the general works of Vernes, Drummond, Deane, Faye, and Thomson named above. An excellent Fr. transl. is by F. Martin, Paris, 1906, with notes; a phase of the discussion is by H. Appel, *Die Komposition des æthiopischen Henochbuches*, Gütersloh, 1906. A very full list of literature is given by Schürer, *Geschichte*, iii. 203–209. For the **Slavonic Enoch** the ed. by Morfill and Charles named in the text is best; cf. Harnack, *Geschichte*, ii. 1, pp. 564 sqq.; and Charles in *DB*, i. 708–711. On the **Assumption of Moses** consult: The discussion of Schürer, *Geschichte*, iii. 213–222 (excellent list of literature), Eng. transl., II., iii. 73–83; Drummond, ut sup., pp. 74–84; Lucius, ut sup., pp. 111–119, 127–128; Deane, ut sup., pp. 94–130; Thomson, ut sup., pp. 321–339, 440–450; Faye, ut sup., 67–74, 222–224; *DB*, iii. 448–450. For **IV Ezra** consult: B. Violet, *Die Esra-Apocalypse*, Leipsic, 1910; Gunkel in Kautzsch's *Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen*, ut sup.; Schürer, *Geschichte*, iii. 232–250, Eng. transl., II., iii. 93–114; A. Le Hir, *Études bibliques*, i. 139–250, Paris, 1869; Wieseler, in *TSK*, xliii (1870), 263–304; Gutschmid, in *ZWT*, iii (1860), 1–81; E. Renan, in *Revue des deux mondes*, March 1, 1875, pp. 127–144; idem, *Les Évangiles*, pp. 348–373, Paris, 1877 (also in Eng. transl., London, n.d.); Drummond, ut sup., pp. 84–117; O. Kabisch, *Das vierte Buch Ezra*, Göttingen, 1889; Faye, ut sup., pp. 14–25, 35–45, 103–123, 155–165; C. Clemen, in *TSK*, lxxi (1898), 237–246. In the case of the **Baruch Apocalypse** note should be taken of the edition of the Greek fragments by Grenfell and Hunt in the publication of the Egypt Exploration Fund, *Oxyrhynchos Papyri*, vol. iii., 1903, and of the Germ. transl. by Ryssel in Kautzsch's *Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen*, 1900. For discussion consult: J. Langen, *De apocalypsi Baruch*, Freiburg, 1867; Schürer, *Geschichte*, iii. 223–232, Eng. transl., II., iii. 83–93; E. Renan, in *Journal des savants*, April, 1877, pp. 222–231; idem, *Les Évangiles*, pp. 517–530, Paris, 1877; Drummond, ut sup., pp. 190–198; A. Hilgenfeld, in *ZWT*, xxxi (1888), 257–278; Deane, ut sup., 130–162; Thomson, ut sup., pp. 253–267, 414–422; O. Kabisch, in *JPT*, xviii (1892), 66–107; Faye, ut sup., pp. 25–28, 77–103, 192–204; J. R. Harris, in *Expositor*, April, 1897, pp. 255–265; C. Clemen, in *TSK*, lxxi (1898), 227–237. On the **Apocalypses of Zephaniah and Elijah** consult: Bouriant in *Mémoires publiés par les membres de la mission archéologique française au Caire*, i. 2 (1885), 260 sqq.; Stern, in *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache*, xxiv (1886), 115 sqq.; G. Steindorff, *Die Apokalypse des Elias*, in *TU*, ii. 3 (1899; gives Coptic text, Germ. transl., and glossary). For the **Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs** the best book is the translation by Charles,

with introduction and notes, London, 1908. For discussions consult: Conybeare, in *JQR*, v (1893), 375 sqq., viii (1896), 260 sqq., xiii (1900), 111 sqq., 258 sqq., Preuschen in *ZNTW*, i (1900), 106 sqq.; Bousset, in *ZNTW*, i (1900), 141 sqq., 187 sqq. Also: C. G. Wieseler, *Die 70 Wochen und die 63 Jahrwochen des Propheten Daniel*, pp. 226 sqq., Göttingen, 1839; W. A. van Hengel; *De Testamenten der twaalf Patriarchen*, Amsterdam, 1860; J. Langen, *Das Judenthum in Palästina*, pp. 140–167; Freiburg, 1866; F. Schnapp, *Die Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen*, Halle, 1884; Faye, ut sup., 217–221; Deane, ut sup., 162–192; Kohler, in *JQR*, v (1893), 400–406; Harnack, *Litteratur*, ii. 1, pp. 566–570; Schürer, *Geschichte*, iii. 252–262, Eng. transl., II., iii. 114–124.

On the **Book of Jubilees** or **Little Genesis** the all-important, almost all-sufficient, book for the English reader is Charles' transl. with notes, London, 1902, with which should be used his ed. of the Ethiopic in *Anecdota Oxoniensia*, viii., Oxford, 1895. Other material which may not be overlooked is H. Rönsch, *Das Buch der Jubiläen*, Leipsic, 1874; J. Langen, *Das Judenthum in Palästina*, pp. 84–102, Freiburg, 1866; Drummond, ut sup., pp. 143–147; Deane, ut sup., pp. 193–236; Thomson, pp. 297–330, 433–439; W. Singer, *Das Buch der Jubiläen*, part i., Stuhlweissenberg, 1898; and the Germ. transl. in Kautzsch, *Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen*, ii. 31 sqq., 1900. For the **Martyrdom of Isaiah** again the best for the English reader is Charles' ed. and transl., London, 1900; cf. E. Hennecke, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*, pp. 292 sqq., Tübingen, 1904. Consult further: A. F. Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, i. 65 sqq., Stuttgart, 1838; J. Langen, *Das Judenthum in Palästina*, pp. 157–167, Freiburg, 1866; Deane, ut sup., pp. 236–275; *DCB*, iii. 298–301; Harnack, *Litteratur*, i. 854–855, ii. 1, pp. 573–579, 714–715; C. Clemen, in *ZWT*, iv (1896), 388–415, v (1897), 455–465; Zeller, in *ZWT*, iv (1896), 558–568; Schürer, *Geschichte*, iii. 280–285, Eng. transl., III., iii. 141–146. The Greek text of **Paralipomena Jeremiæ** was published by Ceriani in *Monumenta sacra et profana*, v. 1, pp. 9 sqq., Milan, 1868; J. R. Harris, *Rest of the Words of Baruch*, London, 1889; and by Bassiljews in *Anecdota Græco-Byzantina*, i. 308 sqq., St. Petersburg, 1893. The Ethiopic text is in A. Dillmann, *Chrestomathia æthiopica*, pp. 1 sqq., Leipsic, 1866; and a Fr. transl. is by R. Basset, Paris, 1893. The Armenian text is published by Karapet, in *Zeitschrift des armenischen Patriarchats*, 1895; Eng. transl. in J. Issaverdens, *Uncanonical Writings of the Old Testament*, Venice, 1901; cf. *Apocrypha Anecdota* in *TS*, v. 1, pp. 158, 164–165, 1897. On the Slavonic cf. Harnack, *Litteratur*, i. 916. Consult further Schürer, *Geschichte*, iii. 285–287. The Greek text of **Joseph and Asenath** is in J. A. Fabricius, *Codex pseudepigraphus*, iii. 85–102, and in P. Battifol, *Studia patristica*, parts i.–ii., Paris, 1889–90. The Latin text is also in Fabricius, ut sup., i., 1774; by Battifol, ut sup., i. 89–115. A Syriac transl. is in J. P. N. Land, *Anecdota Syriaca*, iii. 18–46, 4 vols., Leyden, 1862–75; and there is an Eng. transl. by B. Pick in *The Christian Herald*, New York, Mar. 16 and 23, 1904. An Armenian text was issued by the Mechitarists in Venice, 1896. Consult Schürer, *Geschichte*, iii. 289–292; *DCB*, 176–177; *DB*, i. 162–163; and Perles, in *Revue des études juives*, xxii (1891), 87 sqq. For the **Books of Adam** consult: S. C. Malan, *The Book of Adam and Eve*, London, 1882; C. Tischendorf, *Apocalypses apocryphæ*, Leipsic, 1866; Ceriani, *Monumenta sacra et profana*, v. 1, pp. 21 sqq.; Le Hir, ut sup., ii. 110 sqq.; Schürer, *Geschichte*, iii. 287–289, Eng. transl., II., iii. 146–148; Conybeare, in *JQR*, vii (1895), 216 sqq.; M. Grünbaum, *Neue Beiträge zur semitischen Sagenkunde*, pp. 54–79, Leyden, 1893; E. Preuschen, *Die . Adamschriften*, Giessen, 1900; Kautzsch, *Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen*, ii. 506 sqq., 1900.

PSEUDO-ISIDORIAN DECRETALS AND OTHER FORGERIES.

I. The Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals and Isidore Mercator.
Manuscripts (§ 1).
Contents and Description (§ 2).
Sources and Method (§ 3).
Time and Place of Origin (§ 4).
Motives, Animus, Tendency (§ 5).
The Author (§ 6).
History of the Collection (§ 7).
II. The *Hispana Gallica Augustodunensis.*
III. The *Capitula Angilramni.*
IV. Benedict Levita.
Contents and Description (§ 1).
Sources and Treatment (§ 2).
Time and Place of Origin (§ 3).
Motive, Tendency, and Authorship (§ 4).
History and Relation to other Forgeries (§ 5).
V. Certain General Considerations.

The Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals are certain fictitious letters ascribed to early popes, from Clement to Gregory the Great, incorporated in a ninth-century collection of canons purporting to have been made by "Isidore Mercator." Three other lawbooks of the same time and place are closely connected with these false decretals and are necessarily treated with them, viz.: the Pseudo-Isidorian recension of the Spanish collection of canons; the *Capitula Angilramni;* and the capitularies of Benedict Levita. The name "Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals" has been in use since the awakening of criticism in the sixteenth century, and Bernhard Eduard Simson in 1886 gave the fitting designation "Pseudo-Isidorian Forgeries" to the whole series. In the present article the collection of "Isidore Mercator" is referred to as the Pseudo-Isidoriana, its author (or authors; see V., below) as the Pseudo-Isidore. The *Hispana* is the Spanish collection of canons, the *Hispana Gallica* the form of it current in Gaul in the early Middle Ages (see II., below); the *Dionysio-Hadriana* is the edition of the collections of Dionysius Exiguus presented to Charlemagne by Pope Adrian I. in 774; the *Quesnelliana* is the collection published by Paschasius Quesnel (*Ad S. Leonis Magni opera ii. appendix*, Paris, 1675; see also CANON LAW, II., 3, §§ 1, 3; 4, § 2).

I. The Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals and Isidore Mercator: Seventy-five manuscripts of the Pseudo-Isidoriana are known, which differ widely one from another. They fall into five classes designated as A1, A2, A/B, B, and C. Class A1 doubtless represents the oldest recension, although some scholars have maintained the priority of A2; its earliest manuscripts belong to the ninth century, and its codices contain, as a rule, the complete collection in three parts. Class A2 is a recension but little later than A1, from which it differs by omitting entirely the second part of the complete work (the Councils; see 2, below) and all of the Decretals after the first letters of Damasus (d. 384); most of the manuscripts of this class are characterized by a clumsy chapter-division of the Decretals. Class A/B, of which no manuscript earlier than the eleventh century is known, represents a combination of the form A1 with the *Hispana* of Autun (the *Hispana Gallica Augustodunensis;* see II., below) and with the original *Hispana;* the text of the Decretals conforms more closely with the latter, while for the Councils a manuscript of the *Augustodunensis* has apparently been worked over in clumsy fashion and approximated to the Pseudo-Isidoriana. Class B, represented by five manuscripts dating from the middle of the twelfth century to the thir-

1. Manuscripts.

teenth, and class C, of which the oldest manuscript belongs to the twelfth century, are recensions of A/B and B, showing transpositions, additions, and omissions.

The Pseudo-Isidore took as the basis of his work the *Hispana Gallica Augustodunensis* (see II., below), thus lessening the danger of detection, as collections of canons were commonly made by adding new matter to old, and his forgeries were less evident when incorporated with genuine material. As represented in manuscripts of the class A1, the work consists of a preface and three parts. The order of arrangement is historical, as in the *Augustodunensis*. The following table gives the contents in detail, with the character or source of the sections. The numbers in parentheses are dates, the page references are to Hinschius' edition; P = the Pseudo-Isidore; H, HG, HGA = the *Hispana, Hispana Gallica, Hispana Gallica Augustodunensis;* DH = the *Dionysio-Hadriana;* Q = the *Quesnelliana.*

2. Contents and Description.

Preface, pp. 17–20; by P.

I. Decretals from Clement to Melchiades (d. 314), pp. 20–247.
- 1. Introductory, pp. 20–30.
  - a. Letter from Aurelius, bishop of Carthage, to Damasus (366–384) asking for copies of decisions of all popes from Peter to Damasus, with the reply of the latter, pp. 20–21; forgeries by P.
  - b. *Ordo de celebrando concilio*, pp. 22–24; genuine, from HG.
  - c. Table of contents to parts i. and ii., pp. 25–26; nos. 1–32 by P, nos. 33–78 genuine, from HG.
  - d. Fifty "Apostolic Canons" (also in HGA from DH) and a brief letter from Jerome to Damasus, pp. 26–30; both forgeries earlier than P; for the former, see Apostolic Constitutions and Canons, §§ 1, 4.
- 2. Sixty decretals representing all popes (thirty in number) from Clement to Melchiades, pp. 30–247; all forgeries, most of them by P, the few which he has borrowed (e.g., the two letters of Clement which open the series) interpolated by him. The *Liber pontificalis* was used as a historical guide and furnished some of the subject-matter.

II. Councils, pp. 247–444.
- 1. Introductory, pp. 247, 257.
  - a. *De primitiva ecclesia et synodo Nicæna*, pp. 247–249; pseudo-Isidorian.
  - b. The "Donation of Constantine" (q.v.), pp. 249–254; forgery earlier than P.
  - c. *Quo tempore actum sit Nicænum concilium*, p. 254; from HG.
  - d. *Epistola vel præfatio Nicæni concilii*, pp. 254–257; composed in the fifth century, from Q.
  - e. *Alia præfatio ejusdem concilii metrice composita*, p. 257; in HGA from DH.
- 2. Canons of fifty-four synods—Greek to Chalcedon, 451 (including the canons of Sardica, forged probably in the fifth century), African, Gallic to the Third Arles, 524, and Spanish to the Thirteenth Toledo, 683, pp. 258–444; for the most part genuine = part i. of HG with some interpolations and additions.

III. Decretals from Silvester (314–335) to Gregory II. (715–731), pp. 444–754.
- 1. Introductory, pp. 444–448.
  - a. A brief preface, p. 444; from H.
  - b. Table of contents to part iii. pp. 445–448; from no. 26 based on the table of HGA.
- 2. Decretals of thirty-three popes from Silvester to Gregory II., pp. 449–754; in general = part ii. of HGA. Compared with H, fourteen apocryphal and seven genuine insertions are found, viz.: Apocryphal: (1) pp. 449–451, the so-called "Constitution of Silvester," a forgery of the early sixth century, worked over by P; (2) pp. 451–498, twelve Pseudo-Isidorian forgeries from Marcus (336) to Liberius (352–366); (3) pp. 498–499, letter from Damasus to Jerome and Jerome's answer, forgeries, Pseudo-Isidorian and earlier than P respectively; (4) pp. 501–508, letter of Archbishop Stephen and three African councils to Damasus and answer, Pseudo-Isidorian (in HGA); (5) pp. 509–515, Damasus *De vana superstitione chorepiscoporum vitanda*, pseudo-Isidorian (in HGA); (6) pp. 519–520, Damasus, *Ad episcopos per Italiam constitutos*, Pseudo-Isidorian; (7) pp. 525–527, two letters of Anastasius, by P; (8) pp. 561–565, letter of Sixtus III., by P; (9) pp. 628–629, decretal of Leo I., *De privilegio chorepiscoporum*, and Silverius' *Damnatio Vigilii*, earlier than P (the tract *Cum de ordinationibus*, pp. 622–625, is from HGA, worked over by P); (10) pp. 675–684, acts of the fifth and sixth synods under Symmachus, by P; (11) pp. 694–709, two letters of John I., two of Felix IV., one each of Boniface II., John II., and Agapetus I., and two of Silverius, Pseudo-Isidorian; (12) p. 712, a seventh chapter added to the letter of Vigilius to Profuturus; (13) pp. 712–732, one letter each of Pelagius I., John III., and Benedict I., and three of Pelagius II., by P; (14) pp. 747–753, letter of Felix, bishop of Messina, to Gregory I. and answer, found only in one manuscript of the class A2 and in those of class C, uncertain whether earlier or later than P, but in his manner and showing his tendencies. Genuine: (1) pp. 516–519, two decretals of Damasus, from the *Historia tripartita* of Cassiodorus; (2) pp. 533–544, seven writings of Innocent I., from Q; (3) pp. 565–580, fifteen writings of Leo I., from Q; (4) pp. 637–649, four letters of Gelasius I., from Q and DH; (5) pp. 657–664, the first three of the synods of Symmachus, from DH; the *Liber apologeticus* of Ennodius (d. 521) is inserted here (pp. 664–675) with a characteristic interpolation (p. 665), and, further, two letters of the same Ennodius, ascribed to Symmachus (pp. 684–686); (6) pp. 735–747, four letters of Gregory I., one from the *Collectio Pauli*, three from uncertain sources; (7) pp. 753–754, Gregory II.'s Roman synod of 721, from DH (in HGA).*

The falsity of the Pseudo-Isidore's fabrications is now admitted, being proved by incontestable internal evidence (e.g., anachronisms like the use of the Vulgate and the *Breviarium Alaricianum*—composed in 506—in the decretals of the older popes), by investigations concerning the sources

* Hinschius' edition of the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals also contains the following documents which are not included by the author of the present article among either the genuine or the spurious portions: decretal of Damasus to Paulinus on the condemnation of certain heretics (pp. 499–501); three decretals of Siricius (pp. 520–525); four letters of Innocent I. (pp. 527–533); eighteen more letters of the same pope (pp. 544–553); two decretals of Zosimus (pp. 553–554); three decretals of Boniface I. and a reply from Honorius (pp. 554–556); three decretals of Celestine I. (pp. 556–561); thirty-six decretals of Leo I. with a rescript of Flavian, bishop of Constantinople, and a letter of Ravennius (pp. 580–627); another decretal of Leo I. (pp. 629–639); three decretals of Hilary (pp. 630–632); one decretal of Simplicius and a letter of Acatius, bishop of Constantinople (pp. 632–633); three decretals of Felix III. (pp. 633–635); Gelasius, *De recipiendis et non recipiendis libris* (pp. 635–637); two decretals of Gelasius (pp. 650–654); a letter of Anastasius II. to the Emperor Anastasius (pp. 654–657); a letter of Symmachus (p. 657); a decretal of Hormisdas and replies (pp. 686–694); decretal of Vigilius to Profuturus (pp. 710–712); and three decretals of Gregory the Great (pp. 732–735).

and method of the fabricator (see 3, below), and by the fact that Pseudo-Isidorian letters were unknown before 852.

3. Sources and Method.

The fabrications of the Pseudo-Isidore are not expressed in his own language, but consist of sentences, phrases, and words taken from older writings, genuine and apocryphal, set together into a mosaic of about 10,000 pieces. The excerpts are freely altered and are sometimes given a sense directly opposite to the original, but by his method the Pseudo-Isidore sought to give to his ninth-century product the stamp of antiquity. The labor involved was enormous; and the search for the sources of the Pseudo-Isidore's excerpts (begun by David Blondel, 1628; continued by Hermann Knust, 1832, and Paul Hinschius, 1863; an additional source disclosed by the publication of the Irish collection of canons in 1874) has shown a reading on his part which is astonishing in its breadth and extent. He may have used abridgments and collections—such as *florilegia* or anthologies from the Bible, the Fathers, etc.—but, even so, he must be reckoned among the most learned men of the ninth century. The following are some of the sources drawn upon: (1) the Bible, extensively (Vulgate text, but with noteworthy variations); (2) the acts of forty-five or fifty synods and councils; (3) the decretals of twenty popes, mostly of the fifth and sixth centuries, none of the ninth; (4) Roman law (the extracts are sometimes attributed to the Council of Nicæa or the Apostles); (5) the Germanic *Lex Wisigothorum;* (6) the capitularies of Frankish kings, sparingly; (7) the *Pœnitentiale Theodori* and the *Martenianum;* (8) more than thirty Church Fathers and other writers, and letters of bishops and private individuals; (9) the "Donation of Constantine," the *Liber pontificalis*, the rules of Benedict and Chrodegang, etc.

4. Time and Place of Origin.

Thus far the results of investigation have been definite and are generally accepted. The field of controversy is now entered with the questions of the date and place of origin of the collection. The recension A2 (perhaps A1) was used by Hincmar of Reims in his *Capitula presbyteris* of Nov. 1, 852, unless the passage is a later interpolation, as is maintained (without good reason) by some scholars. It is certainly cited in the *Admonitio* (by Hincmar) of the capitulary of Quiercy, Feb. 14, 857 One of these dates, then—Nov. 1, 852, or Feb. 14, 857—is the *terminus ante quem* of the publication of the collection, and its completion may be set a few months earlier. It is more difficult to fix the *terminus post quem;* but Benedict's capitularies were completed after Apr. 21, 847 (see IV., § 3, below); and when his fourth addition (admitted to be the latest part of his work) was written, the false decretals were not yet completed (see IV., §§ 3, 5, below). The autumn of 847 is perhaps the earliest date, and, all things considered, about 850 or 851 is the most probable date for the completion of the collection. How long a time was spent in its preparation can only be conjectured; but a cautious judgment will hardly set the birth-year of the Pseudo-Isidorian idea earlier than 846 (see 5 and 6, below).

Concerning the place, it may be asserted with confidence that the Pseudo-Isidoriana originated in the Frankish realm. Earlier investigators believed in Mainz, but this hypothesis is now rejected, and later scholars, almost without exception, turn to the west; West-Frankish conditions about 847 are the necessary background of the Pseudo-Isidorian picture (see 5 and 6, below). In 1886 Bernhard Eduard Simson came forward as a vigorous supporter of Le Mans as the more specific place of origin, basing his hypothesis upon a comparison with two writings which are known to have originated in Le Mans (the *Gesta domni Aldrici Cenomannicæ urbis episcopi*, ed. R. Charles and L. Froger, Mamers, 1889; and the *Actus pontificum Cenomannis in urbe degentium*, ed. G. Busson and A. Ledru in the *Archives historiques du Maine*, ii., Le Mans, 1901), and maintaining that they resembled all the Pseudo-Isidorian forgeries, in language and style, showed the same bias and tendency, and used the same sources. Later investigations have not been favorable to the hypothesis of Le Mans, and it is now discarded. Julius Weizsäcker first suggested Reims, and Hinschius followed with acute and convincing arguments. The province of Reims (the archdiocese, not the diocese) is now regarded as having most in its favor and least to militate against it (see 6, below).

5. Motives, Animus, Tendency.

The Pseudo-Isidore himself declares (in the first sentence of his preface) that his aim was to "collect the canons, unite them in one volume, and make one of many"—a laudable endeavor, but not a justification of forgeries and falsifications. He added some genuine matter to his basis (see 2, above) and so far may deserve the praise of an honest compiler, even though the genuine additions may have been intended to hide the false. At all events, it is clear that it was not his purpose to produce a complete exposition of church discipline; many topics—the conferring of benefices, tithes, simony, monastic matters, some parts of the marriage law, etc.—he did not even touch upon. His main object was to emancipate the episcopacy, not only from the secular power, but also from the excessive influence of the metropolitans and the provincial synods; incidentally, as a means to this end, the chorepiscopi were to be suppressed, and the papal power was to be exalted. The Pseudo-Isidore's attitude and activity find their explanation only in the general conditions of the West-Frankish Church at the middle of the ninth century; and when these are understood, he appears in his true light, not one aiming to serve the ambition of any individual or to advance himself, but as the representative and spokesman of a party. The harmonious cooperation between Church and State under Charlemagne had given way under his successors to an antagonism between the secular and spiritual authorities. Disturbed conditions resulted from the civil wars under Louis the Pious and his sons. The bishops suffered in consequence and found themselves compelled to seek protection from the civil power, where they were exposed to

false accusations prompted by avarice, while the imperial synods, before which they were tried, were political and partizan. Between 818 and 835 several bishops were deposed, and others through fear fled from their sees. A reform party arose and at various synods (Paris, 829; Aachen, 836; Meaux-Paris, 845–846) sought in vain to remedy the intolerable conditions by an appeal to the old canons. At the Diet of Épernay (June, 846) the insolence of the predatory nobility and its disregard of just demands made at the Synod of Meaux passed the limit of endurance in the estimation of the reform party. Redress by secular legislation was hopeless after the division of the Empire in 843, and in their need the reformers grasped at falsification as a last resort. The (false) capitularies of Benedict had already sought to promote their cause by misuse of the authority of the great Charlemagne, and now the Pseudo-Isidore attempted to cast the highest ecclesiastical authority in the scale of reform. From his point of view the Gallic Church had to choose between two evils—either to secure unity and strength by submission (with proper restrictions) to the pope, or to be involved in the downfall of the Carolingians; and he chose the former as the lesser. Perhaps, also, by his fictitious ancient law he hoped to convert the obstinate nobility and proud metropolitans, and animate cowardly synods. At any rate he made the venture in spite of the fact that he must have known it was dangerous and would probably be futile.

The Pseudo-Isidore's regard for the bishops appears in the hyperboles he uses about them (" in the bishops you should venerate God, and love them as your own souls "; " you (bishops) are given us as gods by God "). A charge may not be brought against a bishop by a layman or an inferior cleric. The accuser must prove himself not heretical, excommunicated, of bad reputation, neither a freedman nor a slave, not on bad terms with the accused, not actuated by hatred or avarice, and much more of the same sort. The accused, on the other hand, need take no notice of a charge unless in full possession of his property, income, and authority, the so-called *exceptio spolii*, and it is made the business of the court to restore these if they have been impaired. If a charge comes to trial, both accuser and accused must be present, but the latter can not be compelled to attend. The accuser must prove his charge by witnesses, each of whom must himself be legally qualified to become an accuser, and seventy-two witnesses are necessary to condemn a bishop. The accused has the right of appeal to the primate or the pope at any stage of the proceedings. If by any chance the case goes against the bishop, the verdict is not valid until confirmed by the pope. A similar attempt is made to tie the hands of metropolitans and provincial synods. The Pseudo-Isidorian primacy is nothing more than an empty name. The synod is made wholly dependent on the pope. The papal power is exalted, but solely as a means to the end desired, viz.: to protect the bishops against the political and ecclesiastical parties of West Franconia and make them supreme. What a weapon he was putting into the hands of the popes to use against the bishops when occasion arose, the Pseudo-Isidore seems not to have realized. He looked upon the chorepiscopi (see Chorepiscopus) as rivals of the bishops, who diminished the influence of zealous diocesans, and so discharged the duties of neglectful prelates that sees might maliciously be declared vacant. He would, accordingly, eliminate them entirely. His attitude toward the civil power may be judged from what has already been said. He aims to keep church property in the hands of the bishops, takes from the king the right to call a synod without the consent of the pope (with the object of preventing the trial of a bishop), and forbids the accusation or condemnation of a bishop in a civil court. He even extends the episcopal jurisdiction to secular cases (" every one oppressed may appeal to the judgment of priests "), although this is his only incursion into the secular sphere. Political rule he does not claim either for the bishops or the pope, and secular legislation as such he does not touch, leaving worldly matters to the worldly power and its laws.

6. The Author.

" Isidore Mercator " is evidently a pseudonym, the first part chosen to imply that the collection emanated from Isidore of Seville (as was actually believed in the ninth century and later), the second part from the cognomen of a fifth-century writer, Marius Mercator (q.v.). All attempts to identify Isidore have failed, the best of them being mere guesses. Benedict Levita and Otgar, archbishop of Mainz in 826–847, were tenable suppositions only so long as Mainz was believed to be the place of origin (see 4, above). Besides, " Benedict Levita " is itself a pseudonym (see IV., § 4, below). Wenilo, archbishop of Sens (840–865), and Servatus Lupus, abbot of Ferrières (d. after 862), have also been supposed, though without sufficient reason, to have written the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals; while Leodald, deacon of Le Mans, or Bishop Aldrich and his canons are advocated by those who hold to the hypothesis of Le Mans (see 4, above). Three names are connected with Reims—Ebo, Wulfad, and Rothad. Ebo (q.v.), archbishop of Reims after 816, was despoiled of his estates by the emperor, confined in Fulda, and deposed at a synod at Diedenhofen Mar., 835, on the ground of a written confession. The Pseudo-Isidore's *exceptio spolii* (see 5, above) manifestly fits Ebo's case, as does also his fiction ascribed to Alexander I. declaring writings invalid if " extorted by fear, fraud, or force " (the phrase quoted is used by Ebo in his *Apologeticum* of 842). In Aug., 840, Ebo was uncanonically reinstated by Lothair. Again a decretal ascribed to Julius (p. 471 [11. 7 sqq.], ed. Hinschius) seems inspired by Ebo, as it makes his restoration regular. In 841 Charles the Bald drove Ebo from Reims, and in 844 or 845 Louis the German made him bishop of Hildesheim, where he remained till his death (Mar. 20, 851), cherishing the hope of restoration to Reims. The Pseudo-Isidore seems to aim at making the restoration easier when he declares (p. 152 and elsewhere) that, in case of an expelled bishop, a translation may be made at any time and without the synodal decree required by law. It is thus evident that Ebo had an interest in the forgeries; but though it is known that scruples against falsifying did not deter him from seeking to advance his cause by that dubious method, there is no satisfactory evidence to show that he wrote the Pseudo-Isidoriana or that he directly instigated its composition. The case is the same with Wulfad and Rothad; either may have written the work or had a hand in it; there is no proof that either did. Wulfad was canon of Reims, deposed in 853, then abbot of St. Medard in Soissons. He was a leader of Ebo's party, a man of learning and culture, highly esteemed by Charles the Bald. Rothad was bishop of Soissons from 832 or 833. Both men were powerful opponents of Hincmar.

To sum up: It is not known who wrote the Pseudo-Isidoriana. There is, however, a strong probability that it emanated from the aggressive new-church

party in the province of Reims, consolidated by events into a faction bitterly hostile to Hincmar. After his restoration Ebo ordained a number of clerics at Reims in 840 and 841. They were not molested at first after he was expelled, but in 845 Hincmar suspended them (see HINCMAR OF REIMS), and they were in constant fear of having their ordination declared invalid. They thus had a personal interest in establishing the invalidity of Ebo's deposition and the validity of his restoration. Their suspension rendered it impossible for them to perform their ordinary duties; and the painfully uncertain situation in which they found themselves furnished the incentive to employ their involuntary leisure in an attempt to secure relief by forging documents. For the division of the work among members of the group, see V., below.

It was in West Franconia (and in the province of Reims) that the completed and published work first appeared. The earliest known citations are Hincmar's of 852 (or 857; see § 4, above). In Hincmar's contests with his suffragans, Rothad of Soissons and Hincmar of Laon, the false decretals were the decisive factor—in the former case, with help from the pope, in favor of the suffragan, in the latter case against the recalcitrant subordinate. There is some reason to believe that Hincmar discerned the true character of the documents; he was learned enough to do so, but he seems to have deprecated the controversy that must follow, if he spoke out boldly; and, moreover, he was not unwilling, on occasion, to use the decretals for his own purposes and to beat his enemies with their own weapons. It is probable that Rothad carried the decretals to Rome in 864 and laid them before Pope Nicholas I. The first sure intimations that Nicholas knew of them appear in his Christmas address of that year and in a letter of Jan., 865, to the Frankish bishops, both utterances being in regard to Rothad's contest with Hincmar. Adrian II., in 871, quotes a decretal of the Pseudo-Anterus, and a synodal address of 869, probably composed by Adrian himself, has more than thirty citations from the Pseudo-Isidore's collection; it is noteworthy as the first extensive use of the false decretals in favor of the claims of the Roman see. In the reform movements of the eleventh century their full possibilities and effect were disclosed. In Germany the first citations are in the acts of synods at Worms (868), Cologne (887), Metz (893), Tribur (895), and—at greater length—Hohenaltheim (916). At Gerstungen (1085) both the Gregorian and the imperial parties appealed to the false decretals; and an utterance of the papal legate (who afterward became Pope Urban II.) and the Saxon bishops concerning them is noteworthy for its doubting and contemptuous tone. They were introduced into England by Lanfranc. Spain they reached only as embodied in the later collections of canons. It was these collections which did most for their acceptance and dissemination. The oldest which embodies Pseudo-Isidorian material (A2) is the *Collectio Anselmo dedicata*, made, probably in Milan, between 883 and 897. Others followed (see CANON LAW, II., 5, § 1), and a collection made in Italy under Leo IX. about 1050 is little more than a compendium of the Pseudo-Isidoriana (250 of its 315 chapters are from the forgery). When it was admitted to Gratian's *Decretum*, its acceptance became absolute.

7. History of the Collection.

With the possible exception of Hincmar and the guarded expression of the Synod of Gerstungen, no one raised his voice against the forgeries till the fifteenth century. Then Heinrich Kalteisen of Coblenz, Nicholas of Cusa, and Juan Torquemada challenged the decretals of Clement and Anacletus. In the next century suspicion extended as far as Siricius (Erasmus; two editors of the *Corpus juris canonici*, Charles Du Moulin, 1554, and Antoine Le Conte, 1556; Georgius Cassander, 1564). The "Magdeburg Centuries" (1559) and David Blondel (1628) brought the full and incontestable proof. For the history of criticism since then, see the bibliography.

II. The Hispana Gallica Augustodunensis: As already stated (I., § 2, above), the Pseudo-Isidore took as the basis of his work the so-called *Hispana Gallica Augustodunensis* or manuscript of Autun. In the early Middle Ages the Spanish collection of canons (*Collectio canonum Hispana*, *MPL*, lxxxiv.; see CANON LAW, II., 4, § 2) was current in Gaul in a very corrupt text (the *Hispana Gallica;* represented by *Cod. Vindobon., 411 sæc. IX. ex.*), many of its readings being quite unintelligible. The *Augustodunensis* (represented by only two manuscripts—both unedited—*Cod. Vat. 1341 sæc. XI. ex.* and *Cod. Berol. Hamilton 132 sæc. IX.*) presents this text with numerous changes, some of them attempts at emendation which improve the grammar and make sense—though they increase the deviation from the genuine *Hispana* and often change the meaning—but others very striking substitutions and additions. These changes are based in part on genuine sources (the *Dionysio-Hadriana* and *Hibernensis*), in part are pure inventions which show the aims, prejudices, and tendencies of the Pseudo-Isidore. The entire scheme for protecting bishops against charges and deposition (see I., § 5, above) is already thought out. The additions (noted above, I., § 2) are made up by the Pseudo-Isidore's compilatory method (see I., § 3, above). The date of the recension must fall between 845 and 848, most probably about 847 Thus all data indicate that the *Augustodunensis* was produced by the Pseudo-Isidore himself. It may be considered as paving the way for the Pseudo-Isidoriana in double manner—a preliminary exercise in falsification by the forger (or forgers) and a means of preparing the public later to receive the more ambitious attempt.

III. The Capitula Angilramni: This is a short collection of seventy-one brief chapters, most of them relating to charges against clerics, especially bishops, and thus treating of the Pseudo-Isidore's chief theme. It is now generally agreed that they are forgeries, that neither Angilram, bishop of Metz, nor Pope Adrian I. (772–795), whose names are connected with them (see ANGILRAM), had anything to do with them, and that they are closely connected with the Pseudo-Isidoriana. They are usually added as an appendix to manuscripts of the latter of the complete form (A1). Probably they were

prepared independently of the Pseudo-Isidoriana and were used as one of its sources. Most of them appear there in the decretals of Julius and Felix II. as promulgated by the Council of Nicæa. The relation to Benedict's capitularies is uncertain; each work seems to have used the other, and the question of priority can not be determined. Since they were used by Benedict, they must at least have been begun before 848, and their use by the Pseudo-Isidore shows they were completed before 851. More definite determination of authorship and place of composition is impossible. The chapters are first mentioned by Hincmar in 870 with an implied doubt of their genuineness.

IV. Benedict Levita: At about the same time as the Pseudo-Isidoriana there appeared what purported to be a supplement to the collection of capitularies of Ansegis of Fontanella (see ANSEGIS, 1) made by "Benedict Levita" at the request of the late Archbishop Otgar of Mainz, chiefly from material preserved in the Mainz archives. The author declares that he has made no changes in the text of his sources and, like the Pseudo-Isidore, urges others to continue his work. The arrangement of Benedict's collection is patterned closely after that of Ansegis. Like Ansegis, he begins with a metrical preface (seven distichs), followed by a prose preface (stating the origin, contents, and plan of the collection). Then comes a eulogy in verse (thirty-eight distichs) of the Carolingians from Pepin and Carloman to the sons of Louis the Pious. Three books (numbered v.–vii. in continuation of Ansegis i.–iv.) and four additions follow. The manuscripts differ little in text, but very much in extent, some containing only single books or mere fragments. Benedict's work often appears with Ansegis, but never with the Pseudo-Isidore or Angilram. The three introductory sections are to be considered a part of the original work, not a later addition. The chapters of the three books and additions iii.–iv (1,721 in all) are strung together without logical or historical order. References to authorities are seldom given, and repetitions are numerous (in book iii. more than 100 chapters, in addition iv. more than 90). All this was probably intentional, to hide the falsifications, although Ansegis seldom cites authorities, and Benedict says the repetitions are due to lack of time to sift the sources carefully. Addition i (found in only a few manuscripts) is the *Capitulare monasticum* of Aachen of July 10, 817 (*MGH, Cap.*, i. 1883, 343–349); the preface calls it the conclusion of book iii., and it appears in some manuscripts with this book. Addition ii. is chaps. xxxv.–lxii. of the *Episcoporum ad Hludowicum imperatorem relatio* of Aug., 829 (*MGH., Cap.*, ii., 1890, 39–51); according to the preface it was found later and inserted. Most of the capitularies of addition iii. are false. Addition iv. contains 170 excerpts from a larger number of sources and shows more resemblance to the Pseudo-Isidore; the title attributes the collection to Charlemagne.

1. Contents and Description.

The preface says that the collection includes capitularies of Pepin, Charlemagne, and Louis the Pious which were omitted by Angesis; only three passages of book i. are from other sources (the first three documents, from the letters of Boniface of Mainz; chap. ii. 1–53, from the Pentateuch; chap. iii. 1–122, from the *Dionysio-Hadriana*, said to have been prepared at the command of Charlemagne by Bishop Paulinus, Alcuin, and others). As a matter of fact, only about one-quarter of Benedict's capitularies are genuine, and many of these are interpolated. His forgeries are seldom pure inventions; most of them are genuine ecclesiastical documents (or excerpts from such) transformed (with no slight skill in imitating the legal style) into Frankish laws and freely altered. The Pseudo-Isidore's compilatory method is seldom followed. The "archives of Mainz" are purely imaginary (see § 3, below). For Benedict's use of Angilram, see III., above; for the relation of his work to the Pseudo-Isidoriana, see § 5, below. In general Benedict's sources, both immediate and ultimate, are the same as the Pseudo-Isidore's (see I., §§ 2 and 3, above). While, however, he fails to quote many documents from which the Pseudo-Isidore drew, he uses the acts of about thirty councils and the *Breviatio canonum* of Fulgentius Ferrandus, none of which were employed by the Pseudo-Isidore; he quotes Roman law more extensively and from a larger number of documents; besides the *Lex Wisigothorum* he makes excerpts from an ecclesiastical recension of the Bavarian law; and he uses the first and second capitularies of Theodulf of Orléans.

2. Sources and Treatment.

The metrical preface fixes the *terminus post quem* of the completion of the work at Apr. 21, 847 (the date of Otgar's death). The *terminus ante quem* lies between 848 and 850. Addition iv. is relatively the latest part of the work (see § 5, below). The place of composition was certainly not Mainz, as was long believed on Benedict's own testimony, especially as the author's attitude toward the chorepiscopi and secularization does not fit East-Frankish conditions; and Rabanus, archbishop of Mainz in 847–856, knew nothing of the collection said to have been made in his metropolitan city by direction of his predecessor. Moreover, the alleged Mainz Levite appears to have known so little of the city that he located it on the wrong side of the Rhine. The animus and prejudices of the work, and the fact that it was first and most used in West Franconia, point to its origin there; and the close relations between Benedict and the Pseudo-Isidore (see § 5, below) indicate the archbishopric of Reims. If Benedict had never been in Mainz, of course his "archives of Mainz" are a fiction.

3. Time and Place of Origin.

Benedict is far more comprehensive than the Pseudo-Isidore in the subjects he handles, and he even encroaches on the domain of purely secular legislation. His genuine material may have been included with the hope, secondarily, that something might be done to remedy abuses by calling attention to the actual law. Primarily, however, his genuine matter was only a framework for his inventions, and it is the latter which reveal his main motive. The Pseudo-Isidore's chief ideas recur, though sometimes in less developed form, so that

Benedict's work bears the mark of an earlier and preparatory effort of the Pseudo-Isidorian circle, incited by the same conditions and environment (see § 5, below). It is not possible to identify the author more definitely, and it has long been recognized that "Benedict the Levite" is a pseudonym. Unlike "Isidore Mercator," it appears to have no reference to any actual personage; hence it is inadmissible to speak of the "Pseudo-Benedict." The additions (especially iv.) have been thought to be by another hand (see § 5, below); but there seems to be no convincing argument to establish a change of authorship.

4. Motive, Tendency, and Authorship.

Like the Pseudo-Isidore, Benedict sets all sorts of restrictions in the way of charges against clerics, especially bishops, and makes a verdict against a bishop on actual trial almost impossible; he grants the *exceptio spolii*, but somewhat less developed. Provincial synods and metropolitans are subordinated to the pope. The activity of the chorepiscopi is restricted and their complete suppression is demanded, although here again Benedict does not go so far as the Pseudo-Isidore. Predatory secularization is attacked with vehemence, and the reformer seeks to augment ecclesiastical revenues by arbitrarily increasing the taxes. In the realm of marriage law he violently opposed consanguineous unions. Secular jurisdiction over the clergy is annulled, but bishops are allowed to interfere in suits between laymen; worldly laws contrary to spiritual are invalid, and the king who infringes the canons or tolerates their infringement is subject to anathema; the emperor may undertake nothing contrary to the *mandata divina*. Here Benedict was confronted by a dilemma; the aim of his falsifications was to establish certain rights of the clergy on the authority of secular laws, and he had made them inapplicable. He accordingly set up the theory that laws of the State concerning the Church become valid only when they receive ecclesiastical approval; and by direct statement and inference he tried to convey the impression that the capitularies of his collection had been given papal or synodal confirmation.

Benedict's collection is first cited in the capitulary of Quiercy of Feb. 14, 857 (*MGH., Cap.*, ii., 1890, 290). Thenceforth it appears in synodal acts (Quiercy, 858, etc.), in laws (capitularies of 860, 862, 864, etc.), in literature (Hincmar and others), and in collections of canons (from Herard, archbishop of Tours, 858, to Gratian) on a par with Ansegis. Its influence was greater in West than in East Franconia or in Italy, and can not be compared with that of the Pseudo-Isidoriana. Pierre Pithou, in his edition of 1588, first declared that many of Benedict's capitularies are false, and while his opinion did not find general acceptance, nearly all modern scholars believe Benedict's collection to be a conscious attempt to deceive. The *Augustodunensis* was one of Benedict's sources (cf., e.g., i. 401, iii. 109, 391). For his relation to Angilram, see III., above. His relation to the Pseudo-Isidoriana can not be dismissed with so few words. That at least the three books and additions (i., ii., iii.) preceded the Pseudo-Isidoriana seems indicated by the development evident in the latter (see § 4, above). The Pseudo-Isidoriana, therefore, can not have been one of Benedict's sources, though the capitularies of the latter may have been used by the Pseudo-Isidore, and the internal evidence of both works accords with the assumption here implied, even though some scholars assume common sources for the two collections. Addition iv. is peculiar in that it cites certain false decretals which are not found in the Pseudo-Isidoriana or which, if found there, are attributed to different popes; apparently the final revision of the forgeries had not been made in 848. The relation of addition iv. to the Pseudo-Isidoriana (and to Angilram) needs further investigation.

5. History and Relation to other Forgeries.

V. Certain General Considerations: The close relations between all the forgeries have led many to believe that "Isidore Mercator" and "Benedict Levita" were one and the same, or (the latter being thought to be an actual personage; see IV., § 4, above) that "Isidore" was Benedict. Against this hypothesis are (1) the differences between Benedict and Isidore in certain tendencies (see IV., § 4, above) and in skill of workmanship (the latter showing much greater aptitude in fitting his forgeries into their genuine framework), and (2) the doubt whether one man could have done the enormous amount of work involved in so short a time. Because of this doubt many later investigators have assumed a group of collaborators, all working in common on the four forgeries under the guidance of a leading spirit who furnished the ideas, or less compactly organized, the Pseudo-Isidore and Benedict, for example, working in comparative independence on the parts assigned to them under instructions which secured the harmonious execution of the general plan and meeting for consultation from time to time as the work proceeded. However this may have been, it is no longer possible to explain the resemblance merely by assuming the use of common sources and similarity in point of view and feelings on the part of the authors, or that one copied from another's work without personal communication.

Certain Roman Catholic scholars plead for a mild judgment of the Pseudo-Isidoriana on the ground that their aim and accomplishment was not innovation in canon law, but merely to give to the law as it was the authority of antiquity. Objections may be alleged against this point of view, but at the same time the effect of the forgeries on the development of the law must not be overestimated. Only when the Pseudo-Isidorian ideas accorded with the spirit of the time and had external support did they prove of practical moment. If they augmented the papal power, they were not the only or the chief factor which produced that result. The attempts to exalt the bishops, to free the Church from lay domination, and to make all synods dependent on the pope proved abortive; the primacy constructed by the Pseudo-Isidore had no influence on the Church constitution. The right of appeal to the pope, however, was established (see APPEALS TO THE POPE); the metropolitanate received a blow from which it never recovered; the chorepiscopi were suppressed in West Franconia; and the *exceptio spolii* became a part of canon and civil law.

(E. SECKEL.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The early ed. is in J. Merlin, *Tomus primus quatuor conciliorum generalium*, 2 vols., Paris, 1524 and Cologne, 1530, reprinted with prolegomena in *MPL*, cxxx.; a later ed. is P. Hinschius, *Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianæ et capitula Angilramni*, Leipsic, 1863 (critical, from the oldest and best MSS.). Consult: F. Knust, *De fontibus e*

consilio Pseudo-Isidorianæ collectionis, Göttingen, 1832; F. C. von Savigny, *Geschichte des römischen Rechts im Mittelalter*, ü. 99–106, 478–479, 2d ed., Heidelberg, 1834; *MGH, Leg.*, ed. H. Knust, ii. 2 (1837), 19–39; J. O. Ellendorf, *Die Karolinger und die Hierarchie ihrer Zeit*, ii. 130–192, Essen, 1838; A. Möhler, in *Gesammelte Schriften*, ed. Döllinger, i. 283–347, Regensburg, 1839; H. Wasserschleben, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der falschen Decretalen*, Breslau, 1844; A. F. Gförer, *Untersuchung über Alter, Ursprung, Zweck der Decretalen des falschen Isidorus*, Freiburg, 1848; W. B. Wenck, *Das fränkische Reich nach dem Vertrage von Verdun*, pp. 382–424, Leipsic, 1851; J. Weizsäcker, in *ZHT*, xxviii (1858), 327–430; idem, in *Historische Zeitschrift*, iii (1860), 42–96; C. von Noorden, *Hinkmar Erzbischof von Rheims*, Bonn, 1863; J. J. I. von Döllinger, *Der Papst und das Concil*, Leipsic, 1869, Eng. transl., *The Pope and the Council*, Edinburgh, new ed., 1873; H. C. Lea, *Studies in Church Hist.*, pp. 43–102, Philadelphia, 1869; F. Maassen, *Geschichte der Quellen und der Literatur des canonischen Rechts im Abendlande*, vol. i., pp. xxxi. sqq., 556 sqq., 710–716, 780 sqq., Gratz, 1870; idem, in *NA*, xviii (1892), 294–302; Thaner, in the *Sitzungsberichte* of the Vienna Academy, lxxxix (1878), 601–632; Lapôtre, *Hadrien II. et les fausses décrétales*, in *Revue des questions historiques*, xxvii (1880), 371–431; C. H. Föste, *Die Reception Pseudo-Isidors unter Nikolaus I. und Hadrian II.*, Leipsic, 1881; F. Rocquain, *La Papauté au moyen-âge*, Paris, 1881; B. Jungmann, *Dissertationes selectæ*, iii. 256–320, Regensburg, 1882; H. Schrörs, *Hinkmar, Erzbischof von Rheims*, passim, Freiburg, 1884; A. Tardif, *Hist. des sources du droit canonique*, pp. 132–158, Paris, 1887; E. Dümmler, *Geschichte des ostfränkischen Reichs*, i. 231–238, vols. ü.–iii. passim, Leipsic, 1887–1888; P. Fournier, *De l'origine des fausses décrétales*, St. Dizier, 1889; J. Havet, *Œuvres*, i. 103 sqq., 271 sqq., 331 sqq., Paris, 1896; Hampel, in *NA*, xxiii (1897), 180–195; G. C. Lee, *Hincmar*, in *Papers of the American Society of Church History*, viii (1897), 229–260; Werminghoff, in *NA*, xxv (1900), 361–378; idem, in *ADB*, xlviii. 242–248; Seckel, in *NA*, xxvi (1900), 37–72; Maronier, *De valsche Decretalen*, Leeuwen, 1901; F. Lot, *Études sur le règne de Hugues Capet*, pp. 361–375, Paris, 1903; A. Hauck, *Der Gedanke der päpstlichen Weltherrschaft bis auf Bonifaz VIII.*, pp. 3–7, 12 sqq., 17 sqq., Leipsic, 1904; the works on ecclesiastical law (*Kirchenrecht*) by G. Phillips, iv. §§ 173–176, ed. of Regensburg, 1851; J. F. von Schulte, Giessen, 1860; A. L. Richter, ed. Dove, §§ 26, 36–39, 43, 53, Leipsic, 1867; F. Walter, §§ 95–99, 14th ed., Bonn, 1871; J. B. Sägmuller, Freiburg, 1900–04; and E. Friedberg, pp. 46–47, 121–124, 281, Leipsic, 1903; Schaff, *Christian Church*, iv. 266–273; Neander, *Christian Church*, iii. 346 sqq., Milman, *Latin Christianity*, iii. 58–66, v. 398; Hauck, *KD*, ii. 522–533; *KL*, x. 600–624; Rettberg, *KD*, vol. i.; *DCA*, i. 539–540.

PSYCHICAL RESEARCH AND THE FUTURE LIFE:

The Field of Labor.

Psychical research may be defined as the organized and scientific investigation of certain outlying and hitherto unrecognized phenomena—mental and physical—which are on the borderland between spirit and matter. Psychology deals with the operations of the mind under normal conditions; and many modern psychologists treat the subject from a materialistic point of view, i.e., the mind is not studied apart from organization and bodily structure. The interaction and interpenetration of mind and spirit and resultant phenomena, therefore, form the basic material for psychical investigation, which thus attempts to fill a gap in scientific research. These phenomena may roughly be divided into two groups, physical and mental. Under physical phenomena are classed such manifestations as the movement of physical objects without contact, raps with no apparent cause, *Poltergeist* phenomena (such as occurred in John Wesley's house, in which bells were rung, crockery broken, and the like, without apparent cause), and so on. Under mental phenomena are classed telepathy, premonition and prevision, clairvoyance, apparitions at the moment of death and after death, trance utterance and automatic writing, and kindred phenomena. In the former class the physical world is affected; in the latter class it is not.

The Problem; the Societies.

Whether such phenomena really exist, or whether they are one and all figments of the imagination, was the question to be settled. A group of earnest thinkers gathered together at Cambridge, England, in 1881 to discuss this question, and in 1882 the English Society for Psychical Research was founded. An American branch was inaugurated in 1888 under the general supervision of Richard Hodgson, LL.D., and continued until his sudden death in 1905, when the present independent American Society, under James Hervey Hyslop, Ph.D., was incorporated. The founders of the English Society were Prof. Henry Sidgwick, Frederic William Henry Myers, Edmund Gurney—all of Cambridge—and Prof. W. F. Barrett, of the University of Dublin. Prof. Sidgwick was its first president. Since that date, such illustrious names have appeared on the society's membership roll as Sir Oliver Lodge, Sir William Crookes, Prof. Joseph John Thomson, the Rt. Hon. Arthur James Balfour, Prof. William James, Lord Rayleigh, the Rt. Rev. William Boyd Carpenter, Bishop of Ripon, Andrew Lang, Prof. Balfour Stewart, and Mrs. Henry Sidgwick. Some consider it, as Mr. Gladstone said, "the most important work in the world—by far the most important." The reason is obvious. Here and only here are found phenomena that seem to prove scientifically that man possesses a soul capable of existing apart from the body and of exercising its functions in that condition. The resurrection was, after all, a historical fact, to which Christianity points as proof of a future life. In an age of skepticism faith by itself fails to convince; an appeal must be made to actual facts. Such facts are the phenomena studied by psychical students.

Results of Study.

One of the first conclusions drawn by the members of the society was that telepathy—the power of one mind to affect another otherwise than through the recognized channels of sense—was a fact in nature. By an elaborate series of experiments, it was ascertained that such a power exists in man, and that it can and in fact does become operative under certain conditions. Unsuccessful attempts were made to explain the facts. The only conclusion that can be drawn is that "spirit has the power of manifesting to spirit," as F. W H. Myers expressed it in his monumental work *Human Personality and its Survival of Bodily Death* (2 vols., London, 1904). Vibrations do not seem to pass; space and time do not affect it; it would appear to be a true and direct manifestation of spirit. The application of this to spiritual guidance and to prayer may easily be conceived. The next great advance was made when, on the publication of *Phantasms of the Living*, by E. Gurney, F. W. H. Myers, and F. Podmore (London, 1886), it was first proved that apparitions of the dying occur far oftener than chance would permit. Seven hundred and two cases of a

coincidental nature were published, and it was mathematically proved that the coincidence between the death and the apparition seen was far more than any chance would account for. Further, conducting this inquiry through several years in many countries, it was more conclusively proved in 1894, when the "Census of Hallucinations" was published, in which conclusions drawn from more than 30,000 replies showed that this coincidence was again far more frequent than was mathematically probable. The connection—whatever its nature—was thus conclusively proved. Many cases were produced by both the English and American societies, of clairvoyance, premonitions, and other supernormal phenomena. Generally speaking, it may be said that physical manifestations have yielded but slight and inconclusive results—being proved to be fraudulently produced, almost invariably, while the mental manifestations have proved to be far more productive of results. The most famous case is that of Mrs. Piper, a trance medium of Boston, who has succeeded in affording the strongest evidence ever yet obtained of a future life. Mrs. Piper passes into trance, while sitting at a table, conversing with her sitter (the trance is genuine, and has been tested by various eminent medical men). She then falls forward on the table, and her body is supported by cushions. Her right hand and arm is then apparently "controlled" by an alien intelligence, i.e., a "spirit," and automatic writing is the result. It will be observed that the manner of the production of this writing is not unusual; to all external appearances the medium might be doing it herself. The point to be considered is this: does the writing contain any facts unknown to anyone but the intelligence supposedly giving them? If certain specific incidents are referred to, known only to an individual who has died and who is supposedly communicating; and if, furthermore, it can be shown that the medium had had no means of acquiring this information by any known means; if, finally, it can be shown that telepathy, clairvoyance, and other modes of supernormal operation are excluded, then very fair evidence is adduced that the intelligence who once knew those facts was really "there," referring to them, and reminding his sitters of them, through the entranced organism of the medium. It was as though her soul had been temporarily removed from the body, and her nervous mechanism operated—more or less imperfectly—by a foreign or invading intelligence.

This is the character of the evidence that has been obtained mostly by scientists studying the phenomena; and it will be seen that this is the best and most direct means that could be devised for communing with a soul, granting such to exist. Psychical research is the science of the investigation of the borderland of spirit and matter, and of their inter-communication. Its position is that there are certain definite facts which recur, and which must be included in materialistic philosophy, if the latter is to be a scheme of the universe. If philosophy is incapable of including and explaining them, it is obviously erroneous and non-inclusive. These facts of psychic research indicate that there is a realm of spirit, active and capable of influencing this world more or less directly. Materialism would thus be overthrown, and its theories proved to be erroneous. And it is because of this possibility—because a spiritual order of things might thus be proved, that its present workers regard it as the most important work in the world to-day.

HEREWARD CARRINGTON.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The chief sources of information are the *Proceedings* of the English society, London, 1883 sqq., and of the American society, New York, 1907 sqq., together with the works named in the text. Consult further: I. K. Funk, *The Widow's Mite*, New York, 1904; idem, *The Psychic Riddle*, ib. 1907; J. H. Hyslop, *Science and a Future Life*, Boston, 1905; idem, *Enigmas of Psychical Research*, ib. 1906; idem, *Psychical Research and the Resurrection*, ib. 1908; L. Elbé, *Future Life in the Light of Ancient Wisdom and Modern Science*, Chicago, 1906; E. E. Fournier d'Albe, *New Light on Immortality*, New York, 1908; Sir Oliver Lodge, *Science and Immortality*, ib. 1908; F. Podmore, *Naturalization of the Supernatural*, ib. 1908; E. T. Bennett, *Psychic Phenomena*, ib., 1909; E. Katherine Bates, *Psychical Science and Christianity*, ib., 1909; C. Lombroso, *After Death What? Spiritistic Phenomena and their Interpretation*, Boston, 1909; H. Carrington, *Eusapia Palladino and her Phenomena*, London, 1910; and the periodicals, *The Annals of Psychical Science*, and *The Occult Review*. A large bibliography of pertinent literature will be found under SPIRITUALISM, SPIRITUALISTS.

PSYCHOTHERAPY.

Early Magic and Incubation (§ 1).
The Middle Ages and Later (§ 2).
Mesmer (§ 3).
Bertrand and Elliotson (§ 4).
Braid, Liébault, Bernheim, and Tuke (§ 5).
Recent Movements in the United States (§ 6).
The Emmanuel Movement (§ 7).

The term psychotherapy (Gk. *Psychē*, "soul," and *therapeuein*, "to heal"), taken largely, denotes the treatment of disease through the influence of mental, moral, and spiritual states upon the body. An exhaustive discussion of the subject would involve an examination of many crude and fantastic theories, partly theological, partly metaphysical or psychological, with which the fundamental ideas of psychotherapy have been connected. The purpose of this article is to sketch briefly the history of psychotherapy, and to state the main principles which underlie it in the scientific form that it has assumed to-day.

In one fashion or another, psychotherapy has been practised, consciously or unconsciously, not only by all medical men, but also by those who in pre-medical times played the part both of priest and of physician. It rests upon what has become the fundamental dogma of modern physiological psychology—the idea that mind and body constitute a unity, that for every thought and feeling, however slight, there is a corresponding nervous event, and that the smallest physical process awakens an echo in the psychical realm. The charms and incantations both of savage and of civilized man are simply forms of self-suggestion, which has, in certain types of disease, curative power. The earliest historical notices of healing through mental influence are to be found in the magical texts of ancient Egypt (cf. G. Ebers, *Papyros Ebers, das hermetische Buch über die Arzneimittel der alten Aegyptern*, 2 vols., Leipsic, 1875). As early as about 1600 B.C. it was the custom in Egypt to heal

1. Early Magic and Incubation.

diseases by touching the person diseased, while various incantations were being uttered; it is known also that certain formulas pronounced over the images of divinities were believed to impart to these images the power of dispelling the poison of serpents. Among the most ancient of Egyptian myths are those of the healing of Ra by the goddess Isis, and of the healing of Horus, the son of Isis, by Thoth, in virtue of certain words supposed to have magical power (E. Naville, *The Old Egyptian Faith*, p. 5, London, 1909). In virtue of the same principle, kings and priests and reformers, under all religions and with every variety of metaphysical and theological creed, have wrought what seemed to their contemporaries to be nothing less than deeds of miraculous healing. In Alexandria, on the testimony of Suetonius, Tacitus, and Dion Cassius, the Roman Emperor Vespasian healed a blind man by touching his eyes with spittle. In the Old Testament the great prophetic figures Elijah, Elisha, and Isaiah were psychotherapeutists. David was able to charm away the melancholia of Saul by the strains of a music the echo of which may be heard in some modern hospitals for the insane.

The inscriptions dug up in our own time at Epidauros, the site of the famous shrine of Æsculapius, the patron divinity of the healing art, show what a great part the mind played in the cures effected. For example, a sufferer from dyspepsia, one Marcus Julius Apellas, who had been cured in the temple, set up an inscription in gratitude to the god. After mentioning some physical remedies which the god prescribed, Apellas continues:

"When I called upon the god to cure me more quickly I thought it was as if I had anointed my whole body with mustard and salt and had come out of the secret hall and gone in the direction of the bath-house, while a small child was going before, holding a smoking censer. The priest said to me, 'Now you are cured; but you must pay up the fees for your treatment.' I acted according to the vision, and when I rubbed myself with salt and mustard I felt the pains still, but when I had bathed I suffered no longer. These events took place in the first nine days after I had come to the temple. The god also touched my right hand and my breast" (Mary Hamilton, *Incubation*, p. 41, London, 1906; [Epidauros and its cures are treated in pp. 8–43 of Miss Hamilton's work]). This inscription probably belongs to the second century of our era. Speaking of the same period S. Dill remarks (*Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius*, p. 459, London, 1904): "The temples of Æsculapius arose in every land where Greek or Roman culture prevailed. Patients came from all parts of the Greco-Roman world. The temples had dormitories; retreats often contained beds for 200 or 300 persons."

During the Middle Ages the science of therapeutics was in bondage to superstition. The church was supposed to have a monopoly of the healing power. Fragments of the cross, the tears of the Virgin Mary and of St. Peter, the hair of martyrs, iron filings from the chains that had bound Peter and Paul, were regarded as miraculously efficacious in the cure of disease. Great personalities, such as the founders of cloisters, or persons of great sanctity, such as Francis of Assisi, Catharine of Siena, and Bernard of Clairvaux (qq.v.), it was claimed, healed multitudes by the power of their touch.

2. The Middle Ages and Later. In France from medieval times down to the age of Charles X. the kings claimed the gift of "touching for the evil" (scrofula). In the Anglican prayer-book there was printed down to the year 1719, "The Office for Touching." The actual ceremony is described by Evelyn in his *Diary* (ed. W. Bray, in *Memoirs*, London, 1818–19; by Upcott, 1827; by H. B. Wheatley, 4 vols., 1879) under date July 6, 1660. Among the famous persons touched for the evil was Samuel Johnson, in the reign of Queen Anne.

The short and easy way of dealing with these stories was to reject them as superstitious legends. Modern investigation, however, has shown that this method is quite too drastic, and that thus to deal with human testimony is to make the search for historical truth almost futile. The generally received view to-day is that the principle by which these phenomena were brought about is what is called "Suggestion," or expectant attention; and it may be said that in all modern mental healing systems these psychological influences play a dominating rôle. It was only in the eighteenth century that the foundations for a scientific understanding of the subject were laid. Just as chemistry arose out of alchemy, and astronomy out of astrology, and the science of internal medicine out of the tentative therapeutic efforts of the medicine man, so modern scientific psychotherapy takes its origin in mesmerism.

3. Mesmer. Friedrich (or Franz) Anton Mesmer (b. at Iznang, 11 m. n.w. of Constance, May 23, 1733; graduated at Vienna in medicine, taking for his thesis, "On the Influence of the Planets on the Human Body," published in 1766; d. at Meersburg, 5 m. e. of Constance, Mar. 5, 1815) first came into notice in 1773 by his novel method of curing disease through the application of magnetized plates to the human body. He was an ardent student of the medieval mystics, Paracelsus and the Rosicrucians (q.v.), from whom he obtained the idea that there existed in nature a mysterious and subtle force which he called "animal magnetism." This he conceived to be an invisible fluid, which by a skilled hand could be so manipulated as to heal all manner of diseases. Some of the methods by which he applied his theory he owed probably to Father Gassner, a German priest who cured sufferers by means of exorcism, his theory being that the given disease was due to demon possession. In short, it may be said that Mesmer found all the elements of mesmerism already in existence. He simply deprived them of their mystical setting, reduced them to terms of matter and force, and thus commended them to the age of reason. Mesmer appeared in Paris in 1778, and in a short time created a sensation by his wonderful cures in all classes of society. He believed that magnetism could be imparted to wood, glass, iron, and other physical objects, and that these in turn could communicate the magnetism to the sick person. Hence he constructed his famous *baquet*, an

elaborate apparatus consisting of an oak tub with a lid made in two pieces, and itself enclosed in another tub. Inside the tub were bottles filled with magnetized water and tightly corked. The magnetic influence was conducted to the bodies of the patients by means of rods and ropes. Mesmer was overwhelmed with the crowds that came for treatment, but was condemned by the medical profession as a quack. He challenged the faculty of medicine at Paris to select twenty-four patients, twelve to be treated by orthodox methods, twelve to be treated by animal magnetism, and compare results. The doctors treated his challenge with contempt, but in 1784 the government appointed two commissions to inquire into the claims of mesmerism. One was chosen from the faculty of medicine and one from the Royal Society. A few months after their appointment, both commissions reported. Bailly drew up the report of the faculty of medicine. The commission rejected Mesmer's doctrine of a healing fluid, on the ground that no adequate proof of the existence of such a fluid was given. The physiological effects of the treatment were ascribed to the power of imagination. With this finding the report of the Royal Society was in agreement. The reports of the commissions were marred by professional prejudice and lack of scientific insight. To attribute changes for the better in the health of sick persons to the power of imagination, and then to dismiss this agency, as though it were an unreality beneath the regard of scientific investigators, was to make a reality the effect of an unreality. They forgot that a psychological factor able to produce permanent functional changes demanded searching scrutiny. Nor did the commissioners note the strange problem which emerged —that Mesmer the quack had been able to work cures which were impossible to his scientific contemporaries. As for Mesmer, the reports of the commissions were his death-blow. He retired from Paris and returned to Germany.

About ten years later, Alexandre Jacques François Bertrand gave a really scientific explanation of the mesmeric phenomena (*Du magnetisme animal en France,* Paris, 1826). He did not deny the genuineness of the alleged cures, but he maintained that the patients were healed not by virtue of a magnetic fluid, but because of their own suggestibility, their capacity for being influenced by the imposing procedures of Mesmer. This explanation, which is accepted to-day, was regarded with incredulity by the medical profession at that time. The truth is, that Mesmer's success had brought into the field a regiment of mysterious, spectacular showmen, who traveled all over Europe and brought discredit upon the whole subject by their fantastic tricks and absurd pretensions. Up till 1837 this state of matters continued. In that year Dr. John Elliotson (b. in London in 1791; studied at the University of Edinburgh, and at Jesus College, Cambridge; d. in London July 29, 1868) began original researches at University College, London. He soon achieved wonderful therapeutic results, though so much to the scandal of his colleagues that the authorities of the college hospital in 1838 forbade him to practise animal magnetism. Elliotson immediately resigned, much mortified at the insult. In 1846 he chose mesmerism for his subject as the Harveian orator. In the course of his address he showed how magnetism could prevent pain during surgical operations, produce sleep and ease in sickness, and cure many diseases which were not relieved by the ordinary methods (*Numerous Cases of Surgical Operations in the Mesmeric State Without Pain,* London, 1843). Although he shared some of the erroneous ideas of his time, there can be no doubt that he was devoted to truth and to the interests of humanity, and that he suffered persecution at the hands of prejudice and bigotry.

4. Bertrand and Elliotson.

But the most important figure in the history of the subject is James Braid (b. at Rylaw House, Fifeshire, Scotland, c. 1795; was educated at the University of Edinburgh; d. at Manchester Mar. 25, 1860), who, in 1841, began his investigations into the nature of mesmeric phenomena. Until his time it is to be noted that the theories usually accepted in explanation of these phenomena were either that they were owing to a mysterious force or fluid, or to self-deception, or to wilful trickery. Braid attended his first mesmeric exhibitions under the influence of the last of these theories: he was anxious to discover how the trick was done. But he became convinced that the phenomena were real, and he determined to find out their physiological cause. In 1841 he gave to the public his view that mesmeric phenomena were purely subjective in character. He found that he could induce the mesmeric state by causing his patients to gaze steadily at some object and at the same time think of the object upon which they gazed. Thus he discovered that expectant attention was a necessary factor in mesmerism, or, as he now called it, hypnotism (*Neurypnology; or, the Rationale of Nervous Sleep,* London, 1843). He was, however, before his time. He was violently assailed by the old-school mesmerists and was regarded with suspicion by his medical brethren. Hugh MacNeile, an Evangelical divine of Liverpool and later dean of Ripon, charged him with producing his hypnotic effects through Satanic agency, and thereby much theological prejudice was excited against his work. After Braid's death in 1860, the subject, as far as Great Britain was concerned, fell into neglect. But in France a struggling physician, A. A. Liébault, published a book (*Du sommeil et des états analogues,* Nancy, 1866) in which he showed that hypnotism was a powerful curative agent, and once more demonstrated that the essence of it was suggestion. It is said that only a single copy of his book was sold. In 1882 Hippolyte Bernheim, a distinguished physician of Nancy, became interested in Liébault's work, and published his famous work on suggestive therapeutics (*Hypnotisme, suggestion et psychotherapie,* France, 1890). Meantime, at Paris, at the Salpétrière, Dr. Jean Martin Charcot experimented in hypnotism, and founded a school of which Janet, Binet, and Féré are brilliant representatives. Down to this time in England and in America, the movement which attracted so much

5. Braid, Liébault, Bernheim, and Tuke.

attention on the continent of Europe was seriously hurt by the rise of spiritualism. Both the scientist and the man on the street confused hypnotism with spiritualism; but with the fame of Nancy and Paris, English and American physicians began to take an interest in the subject. Worthy of mention is Dr. Daniel Hack Tuke's work (*Illustrations of the Influence of the Mind upon the Body*, London, 1872). This was the first comprehensive and scientific treatment of the subject in English. His aim was to induce the medical profession to utilize in their practise the influence of mental states, and, as he says, to rescue psychotherapy from "the eccentric orbits of quackery and force it to tread with measured step the ordinary paths of legitimate medicine." Dr. William Benjamin Carpenter's *Principles of Mental Physiology* (London, 1874) marked an epoch in the study of psychological medicine. It had great influence upon professional students of mental diseases, but neither this book nor Dr. Tuke's made any great impression on the general practitioner. The attention of American physicians was drawn to the subject mainly through the fame of Nancy and Paris. Boston, especially, became the center of the new study, and indeed is now the seat of a psychological school of physicians. Morton Prince, Boris Sidis, and James Jackson Putnam (who has been called "the Charcot of America") are among the leaders of this group. Its strength lies in its grasp of the psychic factors in psychological states. Its weakness is its failure to recognize the curative influence of an idealistic conception of life or of a more satisfactory religious experience.

In the course of time it has come to be recognized that hypnotism is only one weapon, and by no means the chief weapon, in the psychotherapeutist's armory. Indeed, except in a small group of deep-rooted perversions, hypnotism is falling more and more into the background. The great psychotherapeutic classical methods to-day are ordinary or waking suggestion, explanation, encouragement, education and reeducation, psycho-analysis, rest, and work. We owe this development to such neurologists as Weir Mitchell, J. P. Möbius, Forel, Freud, and the layman, Grohmann.

At this point logically occurs consideration of mental healing or irregular and unscientific psychotherapy.

6. Recent Movements in the United States.

The various forms of mind cure or faith cure in the United States may be traced back to Phineas Parkhurst Quimby (see SCIENCE, CHRISTIAN), the son of a New England blacksmith. He was a self-educated man, with much natural shrewdness and power. When he arrived at manhood he became interested in mesmerism and occult phenomena, which at that time were much discussed among the semi-educated classes of the country. Quimby was discontented with the current theology and the popular notions of mind and body. He determined to create a philosophy, a theology, and a medical science for himself. Gradually the conviction dawned on him that disease was not real, but only an ancient delusion handed down from generation to generation. In the strength of this conviction he set up as an unconventional practitioner in Portland, Me., and there treated such sufferers as came to him. He published no books, nor did he found a school, but he committed to paper his ideas, and ten volumes of his manuscripts are in existence. His memory, however, probably would have perished, had it not been for the visit paid to him in 1862 by one Mrs. Patterson, suffering from some nervous trouble. He was able to cure her. This Mrs. Patterson achieved world-wide fame as the founder of a new religion, the writer of a sacred book, and the creator of a growing church. The name by which she is known is Mrs. Mary Baker Eddy (q.v.; see also SCIENCE, CHRISTIAN). Christian Science may not unjustly be described as an almost equally "grotesque mixture of crude pantheism, misunderstood psychological or philosophical truths, and truly Christian beliefs and conceptions" (G. T. Ladd, *Philosophy of Religion*, i. 167, 2 vols., New York, 1905). The fundamental idea of Christian Science is the unreality of sickness, of matter, of evil, and of the human mind, usually called by Christian Science writers "mortal mind." Its philosophic postulates, as stated by Mrs. Eddy, are as follows: (1) God is All; (2) God is Good; (3) God is Mind; (4) God is Spirit, being All. Nothing is Matter; (5) Life, God, Omnipotent good, deny death, evil, sin, disease. Christian Science is at once a philosophy, a theology, a religion, and a therapeutic system. Many of the therapeutic results set down to the credit of Christian Science may be accepted as undoubted facts; but unless a break is made with the main stream of right reason in the world and with the Christian religion, the metaphysics, the theology, the Biblical exegesis, and the psychology of Mrs. Eddy must be rejected.

Other movements, notably the Mind Cure Movement, inaugurated by W. F Evans (*Primitive Mind Cure; Nature and Power of Faith*, Boston, 1885; *Mental Medicine*, 15th thousand, ib. 1885; *Esoteric Christianity and Mental Therapeutics*, ib. 1886), and the New Thought movement (see NEW THOUGHT), represented by such writers as Horatio W Dresser, Ralph Waldo Trine, Charles Brodie Patterson, the Christian and Missionary Alliance, under the leadership of the Rev. Albert B. Simpson, may be traced to the inspiration of Quimby's teaching. The influence of Swedenborg and Emerson on New Thought is especially marked. Up till recently the churches have looked with disfavor upon these movements, and have, for the most part, sought not so much to understand them as to criticize and to ridicule.

7. The Emmanuel Movement.

Recently, however, an effort has been made to utilize the genuine elements in these healing cults, to free them from the notions with which they have been bound up, and to make them available for the help and uplift of suffering humanity. This effort is popularly called "The Emmanuel Movement" from the name of the church in Boston where it originated under the leadership of Rev. Drs. Elwood Worcester and Samuel McComb. The fundamental aim of the work is to ally, in friendly cooperation, the physician, the clergyman, and the trained social worker in the alleviation and cure of a certain class of disorders which may be

described as semi-moral and semi-nervous. Among the more familiar types of these disorders may be named neurasthenia, hysteria, hypochondria, psychasthenia, insomnia, alcoholism, and bad habits generally. The Emmanuel Movement is not to be confounded with Christian Science or with New Thought or with occultism in any shape or form. It is under strict medical control, and therefore accepts the conclusions and methods of medical science. It lays no claim to any new revelation or any mysterious doctrines of matter and mind. It is the first attempt of the liberal theological school to bring to bear in a practical way the forces of ethics and religion upon suffering and misery. The movement is distinguished from ordinary academic psychotherapy by including among curative methods the power of religion and morality. It seems, in aim, at least, to be the crown of a preceding development, for it tries to unite in practise whatever is sound in the various mental healing cults that have too often been the field of charlatanism, with the proved conclusions and the recognized methods of the medical profession. SAMUEL MCCOMB.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: For early practise consult the literature on magic under COMPARATIVE RELIGION, and under MAGIC; the work of Miss Hamilton cited in the text is masterly. On Mesmer consult: J. Kerner, *Franz Anton Mesmer*, Frankfort, 1856; W. B. Carpenter, *Mesmerism and Spiritualism Considered*, London, 1877; M. Bersot, *Le Magnétisme animal*, 4th ed., Paris, 1879; C. Kiesewetter, *F. A. Mesmers Leben und Lehre*, Leipsic, 1893. On Christian Science consult the literature under EDDY, MARY BAKER GLOVER; and under SCIENCE, CHRISTIAN. On the general subject of psychotherapy read: A. Moll, *Hypnotism*, New York, 1890; P. Dubois, *Psychic Treatment of Nervous Disorders*, New York, 1905; idem, *Influence of the Mind on the Body*, ib. 1906; A. H. Forel, *Hygiene of Nerves and Mind in Health and Disease*, New York, 1907; P. Dearmer, *Body and Soul. An Inquiry into the Effects of Religion upon Health, with a Description of Christian Works of Healing from the New Testament to the Present Day*, London, 1909; M. Price and others, *Psychotherapeutics: a Symposium*, Boston, 1910; Mrs. E. G. H. White, *The Ministry of Healing*, Mountain View, California, 1910. On the Emmanuel Movement consult: E. Worcester, S. McComb, and I. H. Coriat, *Religion and Medicine; the mental Control of Nervous Disorders*, New York, 1908; E. Worcester and S. McComb, *The Christian Religion as a Healing Power*, ib. 1909; C. R. Brown, *Faith and Health*, ib. 1910 (favorable to the Emmanuel Movement, antagonistic to Christian Science).

PTOLEMY (PTOLEMAIOS, PTOLEMÆUS): The dynastic name of the kings of Macedonian origin who ruled Egypt from the death of Alexander till the Romans incorporated the country in their empire c. 43 B.C. The name means "warlike." The subject has interest for the religious reader not only because of the relation to the Jews held by members of the dynasty, but also because of the fostering of learned and literary interests in the capital which directly affected in the first three Christian centuries the development of Christian apologetics and learning. The earlier members of the dynasty figure in the apocryphal books of Maccabees and in the narrative of Josephus, while allusions to them are thought to be found in the book of Daniel.

Ptolemy I. Soter, also known as Ptolemy Lagus (whence comes the name Lagidæ for the dynasty), was the son of Lagos and Arsinoe, was born about 367, and was in his youth a playfellow of Alexander. Banished from the court of Philip of Macedon in one of the court quarrels, he was recalled on the accession of Alexander and worked his way up to high rank and popularity with his fellows by the rare qualities of diligence and avoidance of intrigue. On the death of Alexander he received the province of Egypt as satrap in 323, probably fully determined to establish himself as sovereign. In 321 his opposition to the plans of Perdiccas, who was practically regent after Alexander's death, by having the body of the conqueror brought to Egypt, caused Ptolemy to break with Perdiccas, who invaded Egypt and was assassinated after an unsuccessful attack upon Ptolemy. The latter then maintained himself in Egypt against Antigonus, after vainly attempting to hold Syria, but ruled as satrap until 305 in the name of the youthful successor of Alexander. With the partition of Alexander's empire the strife between the powers of the Nile and the Euphrates for the possession of Palestine was renewed. About 320 Ptolemy assailed Syria, and Jerusalem was taken on a Sabbath when the Jews refused to fight. The resistance by Jews and Samaritans was made the pretext for the deportation of large numbers of both peoples from town and country in order to settle the new city of Alexandria and other parts of Egypt, while to voluntary immigrants Ptolemy offered attractive inducements. Throughout their history the Jews had always manifested a fondness for Egypt, and generous treatment by Ptolemy rendered that region once more attractive to them. Their commercial aptitude, industry, higher morality, and preference for the Greeks as against the native Egyptians gained for them the confidence of the rulers, although it aroused the hatred of the native population. Meanwhile the possession of Palestine was hotly disputed between Ptolemy and Antigonus while the latter lived, and by the latter's son Demetrius. Decisive battles, in which alternately Ptolemy and his opponent were victorious, were fought in 315, 312, 301, 297, and later. Meanwhile Ptolemy carried on the construction of the city of Alexandria, founding there the museum and the famous library. He assigned the northeastern portion of the city to the Jews, settling there the prisoners of war taken in his Syrian campaigns and those whom his policy induced to settle voluntarily. Thenceforth Alexandrian Jews had an honorable position in the entire history of their race. This is of course natural when it is recalled that Philo estimated the number of Jews present in Egypt in his day at a million, most of whom were in Alexandria. While in the city most of the Jews lived in the quarter stated, they before long came to have residences throughout the capital. Ptolemy's disposition, shown both to those of Hebrew race and to the Egyptians, was gentle and kind, his government was firm and tactful, while his aim was the welfare of the people in material, artistic, scientific, and literary directions. With his reign at Alexandria are associated such celebrities as Demetrius the Phalerean, Zenodotus, Hecatæus, Euclid, and Hierophilus the anatomist (who may have initiated vivisection); Alexandria became the most attractive city in the world for the learned, artistic, and scientists; literature flourished, the people exercised their choice in matters of religion,

and the king was popular with all classes. He died in 283 B.C.

Ptolemy II. Philadelphus (285–247) was associated in the government by his father two years before the latter's death—a policy that became habitual with this dynasty. He was the youngest son of his father, though what caused the supersession of his older brothers does not appear. That he at first felt his position to be precarious is shown by his having one brother, perhaps two, executed for conspiracy and by banishing the counselor of his father, who had advised against elevating the youngest son. He followed his father's policy of promoting the arts and sciences, continued the construction and equipment of the museum and library, placed Zenodotus and then Callimachus in charge of the latter, erected the Pharos, built temples, founded cities, cleared canals, reclaimed waste lands, and developed trade. He is made by Jewish tradition the especial patron of the nation, its temple and Scriptures, the translation of the Hebrew Old Testament into Greek being accredited to his initiative (see BIBLE VERSIONS, A, I.; ARISTEAS). His treatment of the province of Syria and Palestine seems to have been generous, the taxes were light, and when they were paid, practical autonomy was accorded the inhabitants—as is shown by the fact that feuds between Samaritans and Jews were frequent and that the latter were also embroiled with the holders of Philistine territory. Diplomatically Ptolemy's shrewdest stroke was his embassy to Rome and his generous treatment of the ambassadors sent by the senate, which he followed up by refusing a loan to Carthage. About 280 he made Palestine, Cœle-Syria, and Phenicia an integral part of his kingdom, and they remained attached to Egypt till about 198 B.C., when Antiochus the Great (see SELEUCIDÆ) won them for Syria. A consequence of Ptolemy's conquest was the Hellenization of Philadelphia, the old Rabbath Ammon, Ptolemais (Acre), and Philoteria on the Sea of Galilee. This Ptolemy began the Egyptian practise so common with the later Ptolemies and married his sister Arsinoe, though this marriage took place comparatively late in life (probably in 278–277), and in the inscriptions Arsinoe figures repeatedly and prominently.

Ptolemy III. Euergetes (247–222), the oldest son of Philadelphus, seems to have been associated with his father for several years in joint administration. He began his reign with a campaign in Syria, partly to retain it as a constituent of the empire and partly to save the life and then to avenge the murder of his sister Berenice by her rival Laodice, wife of Antiochus II. Theos. In connection with this campaign there formerly existed an inscription claiming for Ptolemy conquest of the East as far as Media, Susiana, and Bactriana. But the expedition must have been a mere raid so far as the Euphratean regions were concerned, though it recovered images carried away long before by Cambyses (see MEDO-PERSIA), and so was popular with the Egyptians. It confirmed, however, the rule of Egypt over the regions east of the Mediterranean. On his return, so Jewish tradition reports, the king offered large sacrifices at the temple in Jerusalem. A memorial of the entire affair and of activities at home is found in the stele of Canopus, a trilingual inscription of the year 238 B.C., which is of value in several directions (see INSCRIPTIONS, I., § 3). After this war, ending in 245, Euergetes devoted himself to developing the resources of the country, employing much time and money also in building sanctuaries and temples at Esneh, Edfu, Karnak, and Philæ, or in repairing or adorning them. Evidences abound to show that this Ptolemy was tender in his regard for the religious feelings of the native Egyptians and that the priests were his constant advisers. His external policy was one of assistance to the states opposed to Macedon. Among benefactions the most noted is that to the Rhodians after the great earthquake of 224 which wrecked the famous Colossus and ruined the walls and docks and thus menaced the future of the place. Great largess of money, corn, timber, and of workmen and their wages attested Ptolemy's sympathy with the sufferers as well as his generosity. Thus under the first three Ptolemies the welfare of Egypt was carefully protected and fostered. These reigns mark the most prosperous and perhaps the happiest years Egypt has ever known till the rule of the British in the last quarter century.

With **Ptolemy IV. Philopator** (222–205) begins the decline of the dynasty. There is some reason to doubt whether Polybius, the chief authority for this reign, has correctly painted the character of this king in making him a murderer, a drunkard, and debauchee, indifferent to the cares of government at home and to the needs of the provinces external to Egypt. This Ptolemy, who appears to have been under the complete control of the astute Sosibius, his unscrupulous adviser and chancellor, is charged with the murder of his brother Magas, his uncle Lysimachus, his mother Berenice, and his sister-wife Arsinoe. According to the historians, insurrection at home was the natural consequence of failure to conduct properly the affairs of government, and led to the death of the celebrated Cleomenes, whose story is told in Plutarch's "Lives." The opportunity thus presented was seized by Antiochus III. the Great of Syria, to attack the Asian dominions of a king too indolent or too much engaged in seeking pleasure to govern at home or defend his sway abroad. Encouraged by Theodotus, the Egyptian governor of Cœle-Syria (q.v.), whose deserts had not been recognized by Ptolemy, Antiochus began, in 220, the series of attacks which led to the detachment of its Asian possessions from the Egyptian crown and their assumption by the Syrian government. By 218 these regions seemed completely lost to Egypt. But Sosibius and his clique were aroused by the danger, used the diplomacy of delay until their preparations were completed, and in 217 won a decisive victory near Raphia. Ptolemy even then did not fully gage the danger, or was too confident or too indolent to press his advantage, and struck a treaty with Antiochus. There are indications that after Ptolemy's return to Egypt there was either a series of local insurrections or a wide-spread disaffection which required considerable time to overcome by mercenaries. It appears to have been in large part a peasants' war,

put down by force, treachery, and cruelty. In spite of the generally bad repute in which literary reports have left this Ptolemy, there are not wanting indications that he was less evil than the records assume. He was not averse to literature and is even credited with the composition of a drama, and continued the policy of his predecessors with regard to the library of Alexandria. Detached inscriptions and records show that Egyptian sway continued over distant lands, that the Romans sent an embassy in his tenth regnal year and recalled the understanding with Ptolemy II. Philadelphus, and that the Greeks paid him reverence. Evidence of his regard for Egypt appears in the temples he completed, built, repaired, or adorned. Yet color is given also to the historians' reports that at least the later years of his reign were inglorious. He and the kingdom alike seem to have been ruled by his mistress Agathocleia, her brother Agathocles, and the wily Sosibius. Not improbably to the first two was due the murder of his sister-wife Arsinoe. Jews appear to have been in less favor at the court than under the previous reigns.

An interesting but unreliable Jewish apocryphon supporting this assumption, III Maccabees (text in most editions of the Septuagint; German translation in Kautzsch, *Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen*, Tübingen, 1900; cf. H. Cotton, *The Five Books of Maccabees in English*, Oxford, 1832), deals with Ptolemy IV. It relates that after the battle of Raphia Ptolemy visited Jerusalem and purposed to enter the sanctuary in spite of all prayers and dissuasion; that when he was about to carry out his design Simon the high priest knelt before the Temple and prayed God to smite the king with paralysis; that his prayer was heard, and that the king was carried away helpless; that Ptolemy returned to Egypt vowing vengeance upon the Jews, which he attempted to carry out by removing the civil equality with Greeks which the Jews had hitherto enjoyed in Egypt unless they embraced the worship of Dionysos, while those who refused were branded with the Dionysiac ivy leaf; that a great multitude of the Jews, refusing to surrender their religion, were brought in chains to Alexandria, where the populace favored them because of their uprightness; that the king directed that 500 elephants be made mad with wine and incense and driven so as to trample to death the captives on the race-course; but that when the order was to be carried out two angels appeared and threw the army into consternation while the elephants turned about and crushed the royal forces beneath them; that thereupon the king ordered the Jews released, feasted them for seven days, and then commended them to the rulers of the provinces where they resided; while to the Jews was given permission to execute 300 apostates. After this, the standing of the nation with the people was higher than ever. A part of the same tradition appears in Josephus (*Apion*, ii. 5) in simpler form, but in connection with Ptolemy IX. Physcon. The basis of the story in the war between Ptolemy IV. and Antiochus is fairly in accord with the facts, as is the description of Ptolemy's character. But the narrative is turgid, and impossible both historically and psychologically, stresses unduly the miraculous, and in at least one respect follows Esther in that it attempts to validate a new feast, which did not, however, receive recognition. The real fact which the document seems to register is a change in the condition of the Jews in Egypt, subjection to higher taxation, or the like. The willingness of the Jews in Palestine to receive the rule of Antiochus reveals some basis for the story in the change of their feelings toward Egypt, toward which they had had so good reasons to be friendly.

Ptolemy V. Epiphanes Eucharistus (205–182) was a child of five when he came to the throne, and had already for three years been nominally associated with his father in the government. The regency during his infancy was begun by Agathocles and Sosibius, whose first care was to send into distant regions or on diplomatic or other missions those of eminent position who might endanger their control. The young king was placed in the care of the infamous Agathocleia; new mercenaries were recruited from abroad, so that the soldiery might be at the call of the new masters and furnish a dependable force. This done, Agathocles gave himself up to a riot of debauchery which soon aroused indignation, resentment, and insurrection. Tlepolemos, a shrewd Greek and a rival of Agathocles, collected forces and took measures by well-timed denunciation of Agathocles to put the latter on the defensive. In a riot Agathocles and his entire family were slain, Tlepolemos became prime minister, while another Greek of excellent character became the guardian of the king and the virtual ruler. External events were no less stormy. Antiochus seized the time as propitious to gain control of Cœle-Syria and Palestine, and entered Jerusalem in 198, thus definitely ending Egyptian possession after defeating the Egyptian forces under Scopas. Philip V. of Macedon also took under his rule some of the Grecian islands which had been Egyptian possessions, only Cyprus and Cyrene remaining of the foreign territory ruled by the Ptolemies. Antiochus was intent upon pressing his advantage, but appeal was made to Rome and the Syrian was forbidden to take further steps hostile to Egypt. Meanwhile a treaty had been made by which Ptolemy was to marry Cleopatra, daughter of Antiochus, and thus this celebrated name was introduced into Egypt. She was to receive as her dowry the revenues from the former possessions of Egypt on the Asian continent, though these regions were garrisoned by Syrian troops, and ruled by Syrian officials. The guardianship of Aristomenes continued with a return of prosperity, until the greedy general Scopas attempted an insurrection and was convicted and executed. There are clear indications that the native insurrections which began in the preceding reign continued in Upper Egypt, and that not till near the end of the reign was that region recovered completely from the Nubians who had pressed in. In 196 Ptolemy took the power into his own hands, and the record of this is on the Rosetta Stone (see Inscriptions, I., § 3). In 193 the king went to Raphia to meet and marry Cleopatra, who proved an able woman, loyal to the interests of her husband. Ptolemy attempted to maintain foreign affairs in a favorable condition, and an embassy went to Rome with gifts (which were declined) and to the Achæan League, this too being fruitless of results. In his later years Ptolemy seems to have degenerated and to have aroused the resentment of his subjects by the imposition of new taxes and by encroaching upon the temple privileges. An insurrection which then broke out was suppressed with difficulty, and the close was marked with exhibitions of faithlessness and treachery on the part of the king. He poisoned his able minister Aristomenes and estranged his supporters among the nobility, probably by proposing to make them bear the expense of an invasion of Syria which he was contemplating. At this time he was poisoned, not improbably by the old nobility whom he had so recently offended. He did little in the way

of building, and that little in the region of Philæ.

Ptolemy VI. Eupator (182), the eldest son of the preceding, can have reigned but a very short time. He is practically a new discovery, since the ancient historians unanimously made Ptolemy Philometor immediately succeed Epiphanes. But papyri and other documents assure his existence and reign, though nothing is known of him except that, following the custom of the dynasty, he as the eldest son was associated with his father in the government.

Ptolemy VII. Philometor (182–146?), son of Ptolemy V., was only seven years old when he succeeded; but the queen mother ruled ably during his minority, having him crowned in 173. Cleopatra died the same year, and her death was the occasion for the outbreak of hostilities between Ptolemy and Antiochus Epiphanes, the former claiming the continuance of the revenues from the Asiatic possessions, the latter insisting on their return to the Syrian exchequer. Epiphanes was the readier for war, defeated the Egyptians at Pelusium, captured Ptolemy at Memphis, proclaimed himself king of Egypt, and made Ptolemy his viceroy at Memphis. A younger brother of the Egyptian, later known as Ptolemy IX. Euergetes II. Physcon, successfully defended Alexandria against Antiochus, and the latter retired. The two brothers agreed to reign jointly, whereupon Epiphanes decided to make a new attack upon Egypt, but was dramatically ordered to withdraw by the Roman legate Marcus Popillius Lænas. It was in part his anger at this which caused the terrible persecution of the Jews which has made the name of Antiochus Epiphanes execrated ever since (for the results see HASMONEANS; ISRAEL, HISTORY OF, I., §§ 11–12). This event once more brought out the advantage of Egypt as a place of refuge for the Jews and the fact of the favor which they usually received there. For the Onias temple of this period see LEONTOPOLIS. In 163 the brothers Ptolemy quarreled, and the younger drove the other out. The latter appealed to Rome and was by the senate reinstated, while to the younger was given the kingdom of Cyrene. But Euergetes also appealed to Rome, asking for control of Cyprus also, which was granted upon condition that his brother consent. On a second visit to Rome, after suppressing an insurrection in Cyrene, he was again promised the kingdom of Cyprus, but his brother was already strongly intrenched there with forces, captured him and sent him back to his Cyrenean rule with instructions to be content (153 B.C.). War broke out between Philometor and Syria, and after changing sides from Alexander Balas to Demetrius, Ptolemy captured Antioch, was hailed there as king of Syria, but instead established Demetrius upon the throne. In a battle in 146 when he was fighting with Demetrius against Alexander, Ptolemy fell from his horse and died a few days later. During his reign he continued the traditions of his family in constructing, repairing, or adorning temples, leaving records at Karnak, Edfu, Kom Ombo, Der al-Medineh, Dabud, and Philæ.

Ptolemy VIII. Eupator II. (Neos Philopator), son of Ptolemy VII. and Cleopatra, was a mere infant when his father died. His mother proclaimed him, and Ptolemy IX. immediately marched on the capital; but the Romans intervened, adjudged the throne to Ptolemy IX. and directed that he marry Cleopatra. Reports are that on the day of the marriage Ptolemy VIII. was murdered, so that his reign was merely nominal.

Ptolemy IX. Euergetes II. Physcon (146–117) showed himself after his accession what previous events had indicated—the worst of the Ptolemies. The rebellion in Syene already mentioned was probably caused by oppression and misrule; he showed the traits of cruelty and vindictiveness, and was devoted to the pleasures of the senses. On becoming king he proceeded to take vengeance upon those who had opposed him, the wealthy were seized and executed and their property confiscated, while Alexandria was in effect given to the mercenaries to plunder. This appears to have been his course until, in 130, the city rose in revolt, burned his palace, and compelled him to flee. His sister Cleopatra was made queen. But by 128 he was able to return and his sister took refuge in Antioch, while Demetrius II. attempted unsuccessfully to restore her. This action was accepted by Ptolemy as sufficient reason for interference in Syrian affairs, and for a time lent his support to the Syrian pretender Alexander Zabinas, who was successful until Ptolemy transferred his favor to Antiochus Grypus, who married Tryphæna, Ptolemy's daughter, and assumed the Syrian crown. Here once more the Ptolemies come into relations with the Jews, and this member of the family showed such hostility that a literary battle ensued between the Jews and their opponents, and a part of the Jewish defense appears in the interpolated Sibylline Oracles (q.v.). Egypt seems to have been the scene of local revolts during the remaining years of Ptolemy's rule. Yet, like his predecessors, he was much engaged in the repair or construction of parts of temples, and seems in his feelings to have been the most Egyptian of his dynasty. He was a patron of literature, and wrote a work in twenty-four books.

Ptolemy X. Soter II. Lathyrus (117–81) was the son of Ptolemy IX. by his niece and wife Cleopatra, who is reported to have tried to seize the government and to associate her youngest son (**Ptolemy XI. Alexander**) with her; but the Alexandrians forced her to abandon this design and choose Ptolemy X. But she had him put away his sister-wife Cleopatra and marry his youngest sister Selene, and sent Ptolemy Alexander to reign in Cyprus. Josephus (*Ant.*, XII., x. 2–4) asserts that after some years of peaceful joint rule Ptolemy and Cleopatra disagreed respecting the treatment of the Jews, the latter being favorably disposed to them and having as two of her advisers and generals descendants of Onias. Cleopatra pretended that her life was in danger from Lathyrus, who had to leave Egypt, while Alexander was recalled from Cyprus to the co-regency (106). Lathyrus then seized Cyprus, and in 103 interfered in Palestine against Jannæus, whom he defeated. An incredible act of savagery is by Josephus (*Ant. XIII.*, xii. 6) charged against Lathyrus in connection with his Palestinian campaign; it is said that he overran the country, ordered his soldiers to strangle women and children, cut them into pieces and boil and devour the limbs as sacrifices. The alleged purpose was to

secure for his army a reputation for severity that should overawe the foe. It is not impossible that the Egyptian's purpose was to carve out a kingdom in Palestine and hold it as a point of departure from which to regain entrance into Egypt. But he was eventually driven out of Palestine by a joint land and sea attack under Cleopatra and Ptolemy Alexander. About 101 Cleopatra was murdered by Ptolemy XI., who was then obliged to flee, and perished either in battle or at sea c. 88 B.C. Lathyrus was recalled by the Egyptians and reigned in comparative quiet. The one inauspicious event was in the south, where Thebes was the center of a rebellion, apparently fostered by the Nubians. Two years were required to reduce the city, after which it was practically destroyed. Ptolemy was asked (c. 87) to lend his fleet to the Romans in the Mithridatic war, but diplomatically evaded the request. With the Athenians he was in high favor. Like the other Ptolemies, he left traces of his handiwork in the temples.

Ptolemy XII. Alexander II. (81) was the son of Ptolemy XI. by an unknown mother. His grandmother Cleopatra III. sent him with her possessions to Cos, where c. 88 he was taken prisoner by Mithridates the Great, but was treated kindly. He escaped to Sulla and lived with him at Rome till the death of Ptolemy X.; then, when the latter's daughter, Cleopatra-Berenice III., attempted to seize the sovereignty, the Alexandrians sent to Rome for him. A nominal marriage was arranged between him and his stepmother, but after nineteen days he murdered her, whereupon the soldiers revolted and killed him. With him the legitimate male succession came to an end.

There is little interest in the rest of the dynasty. The kingdom was ready to drop into the hands of the Romans when their engagement elsewhere permitted—such as the Spanish war, the war with the pirates and with Mithridates. **Ptolemy XIII. Philopator Philadelphus Neos Dionysos** (80–51), nicknamed by the Alexandrians Auletes, "the piper," married his half-sister Cleopatra Tryphæna, who became the mother of the Cleopatra so famous in history, and also an unknown lady who was the mother of Ptolemy XIV. and XV., whose reigns were only nominal. His reign was turbulent, full of vicissitudes, and toward the end of his reign he was maintained on his throne against the Egyptians' desires only by Roman troops. After his death came Cleopatra, with intervals of stormy rule or joint rule by the other Ptolemies, and then the rule of the Romans.

GEO. W. GILMORE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sources for the history of the Ptolemies are: the histories of Dio Cassius, Diodorus Siculus, Quintus Curtius, Polybius (excellent Eng. transl., London, 1889), Plutarch's "Lives" (especially that of Cleomenes), and the works of Josephus (especially *War* and *Ant.*); R. S. Poole, *Coins of the Ptolemies*, 3 parts, London, 1864; M. E. Revillout, *Actes et contrats des musées égyptiens*, Paris, 1876; idem, *Papyrus démotiques du Louvre*, ib. 1885–92; idem, *Notice des papyrus démotiques archaïques*, ib. 1896; idem, *Revue égyptologique*, 1880 sqq; J. P. Mahaffy, *On the Petrie Papyri*, 2 vols., Dublin, 1891; F. G. Kenyon, *Greek Papyri in the British Museum*, 2 vols., London, 1893–98; B. P. Grenfell and J. P. Mahaffy, *Revenue Laws of Ptolemy Philadelphus*, Oxford, 1896; U. Wilcken, *Griechische Ostraca*, 2 vols., Leipsic, 1899; the publications of the Egypt Exploration Fund (q.v.), which are of prime importance, especially the Greco-Roman Branch and the *Annual Reports;* the columns of the *Classical Review* and the *Aegyptische Zeitschrift*, which reproduce many original documents.

The English reader will find excellent treatment in J. P. Mahaffy, *Empire of the Ptolemies*, London, 1895; idem, *Hist. of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty*, ib. 1899; E. R. Bevan, *The House of Seleucus*, 2 vols., London, 1902; and E. A. W. Budge, *Egypt under the Saïtes, Persians, and Ptolemies*, vols. vii.–viii., Oxford and New York, 1902. Consult further: C. R. Lepsius, *Denkmäler aus Aegypten und Aethiopien*, Berlin, 1849–59; G. Grote, *Hist. of Greece*, chap. xciii., London, 1872; J. Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien*, vol. i., Breslau, 1875; F. Susemihl, *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur in der Alexandrinerzeit*, 2 vols., Leipsic, 1892; M. L. Strack, *Die Dynastie der Ptolemäer*, Berlin, 1897 (takes into account fresh material); P. M. Meyer, *Das Heerwesen der Ptolemäer und Römer in Aegypten*, Leipsic, 1900; A. Bouché-Leclerq, *Hist. des Lagides*, 2 vols., Paris, 1903–04; B. Niese, *Geschichte der griechischen . Staaten seit der Schlacht bei Chaeronea*, 3 vols., Gotha, 1893–1903; Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire*, fasc. xxxiii. 846–857.

PTOLEMY: Valentinian Gnostic. See VALENTINUS AND HIS SCHOOL.

PUBLICAN. See TAXES, TAX-GATHERERS.

PUBLICANI. See NEW MANICHEANS, II., § 1.

PUDDEFOOT, WILLIAM GEORGE: Congregationalist; b. at Westerham (18 m. s.e. of London), Kent, England, May 31, 1842. He was educated in the Westbourne schools, London, but at the age of seventeen went to Canada, settling at Ingersoll, Ontario. He served in the Fenian raids of 1866 and six years latter removed to Tecumseh, Mich., where he worked as a shoemaker. He had always been interested in religious matters, however, and in 1879 became a home missionary under the auspices of the Congregational Home Missionary Society. He was later a general missionary and later still held a Congregational pastorate at Traverse City, Mich., until 1888, since when he has been field secretary of the Congregational Home Missionary Society, and has written *Minute-Man on the Frontier* (New York, 1895) and *Hewers of Wood* (in collaboration with I. O. Rankin, Boston, 1903).

PUENJER, GEORG CHRISTIAN BERNHARD: Protestant theologian; b. at Friedrichskoog (56 m. n.w. of Hamburg), Sleswick-Holstein, June 7, 1850; d. at Jena May 13, 1885. He was educated at Jena, Erlangen, Zürich, and Kiel, 1870–74; became privatdocent in the theological faculty of Jena, 1878; and professor extraordinary, 1880. He was the author of *De M. Serveti doctrina* (Jena, 1876); *Geschichte der christlichen Religionsphilosophie seit der Reformation* (2 vols., Brunswick, 1880–83; Eng. transl., *History of the Christian Philosophy of Religion from the Reformation*, Edinburgh, 1887); *Grundriss der Religionsphilosophie*, ed. R. A. Lipsius (1886); and founder and editor of the *Theologischer Jahresbericht* (Leipsic, 1882–85).

PUERSTINGER (PIRSTINGER), BERTHOLD: Bishop of Chiemsee; b. at Salzburg (156 m. w.s.w. of Vienna) 1465; d. at Saalfelden (28 m. s.s.w. of Salzburg) July 19, 1543. In 1495 he appears, already a licentiate in law (doctor later), as chamberlain of the archbishop of Salzburg, then as vicar general. In 1508 he became bishop of Chiemsee, having his residence in Salzburg. Thenceforth he was often employed in important matters by Archbishop Leonard (d. 1519) and by his successor, Matthäus Lang (1519–40). He ordained Johann von Staupitz (q.v.) as abbot of St. Peter's in 1522 and thereafter the two men, both gentle, earnest, and spiritual, are repeatedly named together. Lang's energetic reformatory measures accorded with Berthold's deepest wishes, and he seems to have both inspired them and given them expression.

When Berthold was sent to suppress the Lutherans in Kitzbühel he accomplished little, his retiring nature being unfitted for decisive action. Nor did he have the necessary practical endowments for the external duties of his episcopal office or the strenuous zeal requisite to uphold its secular and financial rights against the nobles. In 1525 at his own request on the ground of age and physical weakness he was given a coadjutor. His *Onus ecclesiæ* had appeared in 1524 and Archbishop Lang was anxious that Berthold should continue his literary work. In retirement at the monastery of Raitenshaslach, near Burghausen, he finished his *Tewtsche Theologey* toward the end of 1527 (Munich, 1528; Latin transl., Augsburg, 1531; ed. W Reithmeier, Munich, 1852). The translation was made at Saalfelden, whither Berthold had retired permanently, and there he wrote also *Tewtsch Rational über das Ambt heiliger mess* and *Keligpuchel Ob der Kelig ausserhalb der mess zeraichen sey* (Munich, 1535). In 1532 he founded a brotherhood in Saalfelden and later erected for it an asylum, primarily for poor priests, though laymen and women were admitted if they were not Lutherans. The inscription over Berthold's grave, in which he was called father of the poor, was preserved in the Saalfelden church till 1811.

Berthold's writings have far more interest than the deeds of his active and public life; and they reveal the man with no less clearness. The *Onus ecclesiæ* was published anonymously (Landshut, 1524, Cologne, 1531, 2d ed. revised, Augsburg, 1531), but there is no doubt about his authorship. As early as 1548 it appears in a Venetian index of heretical books and in 1550 in the Louvain index. From the latter it passed to the Roman, but since Benedict XIV has been omitted. Berthold's purpose is to call to repentance and reform; for this end he depicts in dark colors the " burden " which lies on the entire Church—a twofold weight of guilt and impending punishment, in which all are involved, but especially Rome and the clergy. The Turks, who were then threatening eastern Europe, are an instrument of the merited doom; and the " reformation " by which the Church was already divided forebodes more to come. The whole is worked up in apocalyptic manner in connection with the last days. Joachim of Fiore, the revelations of St. Bridget, and other productions of the contemporary medieval prophetism furnished material, with which personal observations and experience are interwoven, so that the whole presents a well-ordered and illuminating picture of conditions in South Germany and the archdiocese of Salzburg. Escape is possible only by a true reform; and its nature and method have already been indicated by Francis of Assisi. The poverty of the mendicant monks is the ideal toward which the Church, the papacy, and the clergy must strive by renouncing worldly goods; the immediate means for its attainment is a free general council " where expression is allowed to the lowly and faithful." The attitude toward indulgences is significant; their abuse is characteristic of the present evil time and will destroy the Church if not checked. The most carefully written chapter of the book (xv.) treats of this theme and it accords fully with Luther's ideas and utterances.

The *Tewtsche Theologey* (for editions see above) is the first extended Roman Catholic treatise on dogmatics in the German language and the first comprehensive and systematic presentation of the Roman doctrine in opposition to the Reformation. It thus has importance as literature and linguistically, and is directly connected with the beginnings of the Counter-Reformation. The occasion and aim are stated in the preface—to lead back the misguided to the right faith and to set forth the truth. The polemical purpose is evident in the attempt to speak " from Scripture and the teachers, especially Augustine," and in the selection and arrangement of the material (faith and justification are put first). The dogmas and ethics set forth are really based on Thomas, but in the distorted form usual in the later Middle Ages. Anselm, Bernard, Bonaventura, Duns Scotus especially, all had influence, the prophets of the *Onus* are sometimes heard, and interesting reminiscences of Nicholas of Cusa and mysticism (Tauler) come to view. Indulgences are regarded quite as in the *Onus* and there are other resemblances between the two books. But the tone is different. A polemical antireformation note is struck in the *Theologey* which places it in the Roman reaction. Luther's justification by faith alone is repudiated; the power and privileges of the pope are emphasized. Thus the call to repentance of the earlier book is weakened. Berthold's personality, however, is the same in both works; he is sensible and upright, thorough, inclined to traditionalism and repelled by humanism, defective in academic training. The *Theologey* had only a limited influence either in the original language or in the Latin translation; it was too minute and pretentious, too clumsy in disputation, and admitted too candidly the faults of the Church. (JOHANNES FICKER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: F. W. Vierthaler, *Geschichte des Schulwesens und der Kultur in Salzburg*, i. 151–162, Salzburg, 1802; W. Hauthaler, *Kardinal Matthäus Lang und die religiös-soziale Bewegung seiner Zeit*, ib. 1896; J. Schmid, *Des Kardinals und Erzbischofs . . Matthäus Lang Verhalten zur Reformation*, Fürth, 1901. On the writings consult: J. G. Schelhorn, *De religionis evangelicæ in provincia Salisburgensi ortu, progressu et fatis*, Germ. transl., pp. 17–54, Leipsic, 1732; H. Lämmer, *Die vortridentinisch-katholische Theologie des Reformations-Zeitalters*, pp. 27–30 et passim, Berlin, 1858; H. C. Lea, *Hist. of Auricular Confession and Indulgences in the Latin Church*, 3 vols., Philadelphia, 1896; H. Werner, *Die Flugschrift " Onus Ecclesiæ " mit einem Anhang über sozial- und kirchenpolitische Prophetien*, Giessen, 1901; Greinz, *Berthold Pürstinger*, Salzburg, 1904.

PUFENDORF, SAMUEL, BARON: The first German professor of natural and international law; b. at Dorf-Chemnitz in the margravate of Meissen (either Dorf-Chemnitz bei Zwönitz, 15 m. s.s.w. of Chemnitz, or Dorf-Chemnitz bei Sayda, 30 m. s.w. of Dresden) Jan. 8, 1632; d. in Berlin Oct. 26, 1694. He studied in Leipsic and Jena, was professor in Heidelberg from 1661, in Lund from 1668, historiographer and secretary of state in Stockholm from 1677, and privy councilor to the elector of Brandenburg in Berlin from 1687. In his chief book, the *De jure naturæ et gentium* (Lund, 1672; Frankfort, 1684; and often; Eng. transl., *Of the*

Law of Nature and Nations, Oxford, 1710, 5th ed., London, 1749), he elaborated and systematized the conception of law to which Hugo Grotius (q.v.) had first given expression a half-century earlier, making all knowledge of it flow from three sources —the reason, the civil statutes, and the divine revelation, to which correspond the three disciplines of natural law, civil law, and moral theology. The principle of natural law is the instinct of society, and natural law is a purely rational science, independent of revelation, and taking account of men only as they actually are. This was contrary to the medieval conception, which considered the essential righteousness of God as the archetype, the attributes of God as the norm, and the decalogue as the code of natural law. Religion in Pufendorf's system is a means for the realization of law and God is its originator. He would study theology as a mathematical science and establish its principle by the method of geometrical demonstration. All this was inacceptable to the orthodoxy of the day. Pufendorf was bitterly attacked in Lund, then by theologians of Leipsic and Jena, and a long and unseemly controversy followed. In a work *De habitu religionis Christianæ ad vitam civilem* (Bremen, 1687; Eng. transl., *Of the Nature and Qualification of Religion*, London, 1698) he advocated supervision of the Church by the State and guaranty of freedom of conscience, which can be limited only by natural religion inherent in the State; as God does not judge by dogmas, so the State has not the verdict of heresy. Buddeus and Christian Wolff first accorded to Pufendorf proper recognition. Other translations of his works into English were: *Introduction to the History of the Principal Kingdoms and States of Europe* (London, 1699, new ed., 1764); *The History of Popedom* (London, 1691); and *A View of the Lutheran Churches* (London 1714).

(G. Frank†.)

Bibliography: H. F. W. Hinrichs, *Geschichte des Rechts- und Staatsprinzipien seit der Reformation*, vol. ii., 3 vols., Leipsic, 1848–52; J. C. Bluntschli and K. Brater, *Deutsches Staatswörterbuch*, viii. 424–439, 11 vols., Leipsic, 1856–70; G. Frank, *Geschichte der protestantischen Theologie*, ii. 62–67, 3 vols., ib. 1862–75; J. G. Droysen, in *Abhandlungen der neuern Geschichte*, ib. 1876; H. von Treitschke, *Historische und politische Aufsätze*, iv. 202–304, Leipsic, 1897; *ADB*, xxvi. 701–708. His *Briefe* to Christian Thomasius are edited by E. Gigas, Munich, 1897.

PUL. See Assyria, VI., 3, § 9.

PULCHERIA: Eastern empress, daughter of Arcadius and elder sister of Theodosius II.; b. 399; d. Sept. 10, 453. Notwithstanding her youth, in 414 the senate made her Augusta and guardian of her weak-minded brother. As empress she lived like a nun and transformed the palace into a convent, but for a decade her rule was absolute. After the marriage of Theodosius with Athenais, daughter of Leontius, a philosopher of Athens (the bride embracing Christianity and receiving with baptism the name of Eudocia), jealous quarrels broke out between the two sisters-in-law, although Pulcheria had herself chosen her brother's wife. In the Nestorian controversy (see Nestorius) Eudocia sided with Nestorius, Pulcheria plotted with Cyril and by her influence over the emperor secured the patriarch's downfall; her course was doubtless embittered by a charge which Nestorius had made against her chastity. The schism which had split the Church of Constantinople for thirty years Pulcheria terminated by bringing the bones of Chrysostom to the capital and giving them solemn burial in the Church of the Apostles (Jan. 27, 438). The relics of the forty martyrs of Sebaste, of Zacharias, and of St. Stephen were treated in like manner. In 446 Pulcheria was banished from the court, but four years later she regained her influence, Eudocia having been banished in the mean time and taken up her residence in Jerusalem, where she died in 461. After the death of Theodosius (450), Pulcheria consented to a nominal marriage with the aged senator and general, Marcian, who was elevated to the imperial dignity. She attended the sixth session of the Council of Chalcedon (Oct. 25, 451) and contributed to the condemnation of both Eutychianism and Nestorianism. The Greek Church reverences Pulcheria as one of its greatest saints.

(O. Zöckler†.)

Bibliography: F. Gregorovius, *Athenais, Geschichte einer byzantinischen Kaiserin*, pp. 60 sqq., Leipsic, 1881; A. Güldenpenning, *Geschichte des öströmischen Reichs unter Arkadius . . .*, ii. 217 sqq., 243 sqq., 291 sqq., 317 sqq., 373 sqq., Halle, 1885 (the best modern presentation); Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, vol. ii., passim, Eng. transl., vol. iii. passim, Fr. transl., vol. ii. passim; *ASB*, Sept., iii. 503–540, iv. 778–782; *DCB*, iv. 520–521.

PULLEYN (PULLEIN), ROBERT: A noteworthy representative of the dogmaticians of the twelfth century who sought to collect the opinions of distinguished teachers on various points of doctrine (the so-called "sentence writers"); b. in England of good parentage perhaps c. 1080 or earlier; d. in Rome (?) c. 1150. His name appears as Polenius, Pullan, and Pully, as well as in the two forms given in the title. After studying in England he went to Paris, where William of Champeaux and Abelard were his teachers and where in due time he himself taught. About 1133 he appears in England, lecturing on the Scriptures at Oxford and also as archdeacon of Rochester. King Henry I. showed him favor and offered him a bishopric, which he declined. The disturbances after Henry's death (1135) drove him again to Paris. A letter from Bernard of Clairvaux (Robert's warm friend) to the bishop of Rochester, written about 1140, shows that the bishop had appealed to Pope Innocent II. in an attempt to induce him to return to his benefice. Innocent, however, probably influenced by Bernard, decided in Robert's favor and called him to the papal court. He became cardinal under Celestine II., chancellor under Lucius II., and probably died during the reign of Eugenius III. (1145–53) as his signature is not found later.

Writings by Robert of varied character (commentaries, treatises, sermons, etc.) are extant in manuscript, but nothing has been published except the *Sententiarum librii viii* (ed. H. Mathoud, Paris, 1655, reproduced in *MPL*, clxxxvi.; excerpts are in Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, xiv. 392 sqq.), which was strongly influenced by Abelard's *Sic et non*. Abelard, however, made no attempt to reconcile conflicting opinions. Robert goes farther and tries to unify contradictions by the dialectical method

and the Aristotelian philosophy. He begins (book i.) with the doctrine of God and finds his dialectics applicable and sufficient to prove that God exists, that he can have had no beginning, and that there can not be more gods than one. When he comes to the Trinity, however, he quotes I John v. 7, as the ultimate proof; and all his fine-spun reasoning merely confirms the truth of an incidental remark at the beginning—that the dialectician accomplishes nothing, since he explains "the obscure by the obscure and that which is to be believed by the incredible." The omnipresence of God Robert illustrates by the soul in the body. God's relation to evil is not explained as purely permissive, and thus God is not the originator of evil in the world; to be able to do evil is not evil, but actually to do evil. Predestination is expounded in Augustinian fashion. The discussion of limits upon the divine omnipotence is characteristic of Robert's method. Abelard had asserted that God can do no more than he does and wills; others that everything is included in the omnipotence of God. Robert explains that what would be against reason and evil if it were done, God can not do, since if he could it would be impotence, the ability to do evil would eclipse the ability to do good. Nevertheless God could do much which he does not because he does not purpose it, although it could be done without injury to his goodness. Book ii. proceeds to the creation of the world, with many curious speculations. The doctrine of angels is expounded minutely, a subject to which Robert returns in the sixth book. Books iii. and iv. treat in the main of Christology. The succeeding books are much less systematic. Book v. takes up the resurrection, and then the treatment of the sacraments begins and lasts into the eighth book, with much discursive material. Like Alger of Liége Robert knows of five sacraments. The treatment of marriage and divorce (book vii.) is of much importance for the history of the canon law before Gratian. Book viii. opens with the Lord's Supper and closes with the last things. All elect heathen will be converted and all Jews by Enoch and Elias, and then Antichrist will come. For three and a half years he will rule and oppress the elect, will seduce many from the Roman Church, rebuild the temple in Jerusalem, will be worshiped by many as God, but finally will be killed by the archangel Michael on the Mount of Olives. Then the elect who have been misled by Antichrist will be given forty days for repentance. A great fire will break out and consume the world, burning till all believers are purified. The general resurrection will follow, at which all men will receive back all parts of the body, even the most minute. Finally the last trumpet will sound, the living will be caught up in the air, the judge will come, and the souls which still have need of purification will be cleansed by fire. Many fantastic ideas concerning the order in which the good and wicked will rise, the place of judgment, the separation of the pious from the godless, and the like, are interwoven, with curious and naive discussions. (Ferdinand Cohrs.)

Bibliography: The earlier reports are collected in *MPL*, clxxxvi. 633 sqq. Consult further: L. E. Dupin, *Nouvelle bibliothèque des auteurs ecclésiastiques*, ix. 213 sqq., Paris, 1689–1711, abridged Eng. transl., 3 vols., Dublin, 1723–24; C. Oudin, *Commentarius de scriptoribus ecclesiasticis*, ii. 1118 sqq., Leipsic, 1732; B. Hauréau, *Hist. de la philosophie scolastique*, i. 483 sqq., Paris, 1872; J. Bach, *Die Dogmengeschichte des Mittelalters*, ii. 216 sqq., Vienna, 1875; T. E. Holland, in *The Historical Review*, vi (1891), 238 sqq.; J. E. Erdmann, *Geschichte der Philosophie*, i. 309 sqq., 4th ed., Berlin, 1896, Eng. transl. of earlier ed., 3 vols., London, 1893; *DNB*, xlvii. 19–20.

PULLMAN, JAMES MINTON: Universalist; b. at Portland, Chautauqua County, N. Y., Aug. 21, 1836; d. at Lynn, Mass., Nov. 23, 1903. He graduated at St. Lawrence Divinity School, Canton, N. Y., 1860; was pastor at Troy, N. Y., 1861–68; of Sixth Universalist Church (Our Savior), New York, 1868–85; and at Lynn, Mass., 1885–1903. He was interested in various philanthropic movements, being a member of the Massachusetts State Board of Charities; of the National Civil Service League from its inception; director of the State Prison Association; counselor of the American Institute of Civics; and other bodies with similar aims.

PULPIT: The platform in a church from which the speaker addresses the audience. In primitive Christendom the preacher's position was regularly inside the railing (*cancelli*) which separated choir and nave, an arrangement still further emphasized in the metropolitan cathedral, where the bishop was the preacher. At the same time personal considerations, questions of room, and other influences came to lend their weight in ever greater degree to the reservation of the Ambo (q.v.), which had originally been set apart for the lections, for the homiletic discourse whether inside or outside the railing. A development thus took shape which found its expression in the pulpit, although not until centuries later; the German designation *Kanzel* still reechoes a more primitive connection with *cancelli* ("chancel," or crossbars).

The growing centralization of the entire worship upon the mass, and the more ceremonial decoration of the choir in consequence, no longer allowed place for the sermon in these hallowed precincts, quite apart from the fact that the decline of preaching in the first half of the medieval era took away all interest in the matter (see Preaching, History of).

Developed from the Ambo.

Not until after the sermon had again attained some significance in public worship, did the practical question of the preacher's place in the sanctuary once more come urgently to the front. The historical connection of the same with the ambo, whether in the form of an isolated construction, or accessory to the rood-loft, was still an extant fact; and this was the starting point. The ambo, however, came to be more or less projected into the central nave, to face the congregation. None the less during this transition period and even much later, movable "preaching chairs" of wood continued in use in all Western Christendom. This device was promoted especially through the mendicant orders' habit of delivering sermons abroad in the public squares. Indeed, in the early Middle Ages these movable stands hardly went out of fashion. In Germany, as commonly in the North of Europe, the sermon's place adhered longer to the modified rood-loft that was fitted up for this purpose and for

the liturgical lections. The fuller and freer development of the pulpit in all countries to which it gained entrance was not eventually assured before the late Gothic period in the fifteenth century; while the Reformation movement brought this development into still wider and swifter activity not only in Protestant but also in Roman Catholic jurisdictions.

The pulpit now becomes a conspicuous, indispensable fixture of the interior equipment of churches; and in keeping with its importance it is appropriated by art as an object highly fruitful for its purposes. Its connection with choir and ambo ceases entirely, and the portable wooden pulpit disappears. From late Gothic times onward, the pulpit is a fixed essential to the central nave, and is almost as indispensable as the baptismal font. Its materials in the Middle Ages were stone and wood; the Renaissance preferred wood. Rarely the pulpit adjoins the wall in a freely suspended manner; but usually it rests on a structural base, on a pillar or column. Again, statues appear as bearers—Moses, kings of Israel, Peter, Paul, angels, even Christ himself. At the bottom lie monsters as images of the demonic powers overcome by the Church and now its servants. Not only here but elsewhere in pulpit art, solemn warnings are occasionally introduced for preachers and hearers alike. And still more richly does art unfold itself in the case of the commonly octagonal, more rarely hexagonal or circular, breastwork surrounding the platform. From single ornament to detail figures and entire scenes, decorative art has here been active. Christ and his apostles, the four Church Fathers (in medieval times the favorite theme), saints, especially the patrons of the founder or of the Church—the symbols of the four Evangelists (frequent in the Reformation era and predominantly so on Protestant soil), personified virtues, the well-known typical figures of medieval imagery, Old- and New-Testament scenes, etc., complete this copious cycle. Equally appropriated to the operations of art is the stairway arrangement; an elegantly perforated balustrade, often with statues, embellishes the way. With conscious design to this end, images of Moses and the prophets were employed. A similar decoration was finally bestowed upon the indispensable and often tremendous sounding-board, which in the Gothic era sometimes rears itself like an open tower or towering cupola.

Medieval Pulpit-Decorations.

In the Renaissance age these forms become simplified; indeed, a certain sobriety and monotony come to prevail. Toward the end of the eighteenth century and in the early years of the nineteenth—sporadically still earlier—the pulpit was relegated to the altar's enclosure, and became associated with the altar in such sort that it was either constructed over the altar wall, or else it was erected behind the altar, which in this case was not permitted to have a headpiece. Not only the Evangelical but also the Roman Catholic Church—though the latter in less degree—is implicated in this confusion. The reawakening of a proper understanding for the nature of congregational worship and the right functions of the objects thereto instrumental within the interior of the church, led to spirited opposition against this juxtaposition of altar and pulpit. The custom of covering the front of the ambo with a cloth passed over to the pulpit, and has been maintained to this day. The pulpits or quasi-pulpits which occur as detached externals of churches, served either for the display of relics or for the delivery of addresses on special occasions. Sometimes they stand quite apart from any connection with the church edifice in the square of the church or in the cemetery.

Later Development.

The Greek Church has generally adhered to the simple ambo along the dividing line of the choir. Only in the larger churches, where stress is laid on the sermon, has there been progress in the development of pulpits; though even here their form still variously reflects the general style of the ambo. VICTOR SCHULTZE.

In the Greek Church.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Bingham, *Origines*, III., v. 4, VIII., v. 4; H. Otte, *Handbuch der kirchlichen Kunstarchäologie*, s.v. "Kanzel," 2 vols., Leipsic, 1883–84; J. A. Martigny, *Dictionnaire des antiquités chrétiennes*, s.v. "Ambo," Paris, 1865; F. X. Kraus, *Real-Encyklopädie der christlichen Alterthümer*, s.v. "Ambon," 2 vols., Freiburg, 1880–86; W. Durandus, *Symbolism of Churches and Church Ornaments*, p. 23, London, 1906; *KL*, i. 685–687; and the very illuminating article on the Ambo in F. Cabrol, *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne*, fasc. v., cols. 1330–47, Paris, 1904 (where a vast reference list is given).

PUNISHMENT, FUTURE. See FUTURE PUNISHMENT.

PUNISHMENTS, HEBREW. See LAW, HEBREW, CIVIL AND CRIMINAL.

PUNSHON, WILLIAM MORLEY: Wesleyan; b. at Doncaster (30 m. s. of York) May 29, 1824; d. at London Apr. 14, 1881. He entered the Methodist society in 1838; became a local preacher in 1842; studied at the Wesleyan College at Richmond in 1845; occupied various fields until he was ordained in 1849; served at Newcastle-on-Tyne, Sheffield, and Leeds 1849–1858; in London, 1858–64; and Bristol, 1864–67; presided over the annual conferences and had great influence upon Methodism in the Dominion of Canada, 1867–73; and returning to London, he was superintendent of Kensington district, 1873–75, and one of the general secretaries of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society, 1875–81. He was distinguished for his eloquence, enthusiasm, wisdom, administrative ability, and success in raising money for benevolent purposes. He published *Select Lectures and Sermons* (London, 1860); *Life Thoughts*, sermons (1863); *Sabbath Chimes*, verses (1867); *The Prodigal Son* (1868); and *Sermons, Lectures, and Literary Remains* (1881).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: F. W. Macdonald, *The Life of William Morley Punshon*, London, 1887; *The Rev. W. M. Punshon, a Sketch of his Life, with Sermons*, ib. 1871; T. MacCullagh, *The Rev. W. M. Punshon, a memorial Sermon*, ib. 1881; *W. M. Punshon, Preacher and Orator, with a Selection of his Lectures and Sermons*, ib. 1881; J. Dawson, *William Morley Punshon, the Orator of Methodism*, ib. 1906; *DNB*, xlvii. 37–38.

PURCELL, HENRY: Composer; b. at Westminster, London, in 1658; d. at the same place Nov. 21, 1695. He was copyist at the Westminster Abbey, 1676–78; and was appointed organist at

the same place, 1680, and at the Chapel Royal, 1682. He occupied a place in the first rank of English sacred composers. While his place in this work is due to his compositions for church use, he was a prolific producer of music for the stage, fifty-one dramatic works of his being known. He was a composer also of sonatas, and of pieces for the organ and the harpsichord. His *Sacred Music* (including fifty anthems), *Te Deum*, *Jubilate*, and a number of minor pieces, were collected and edited by Vincent, Novello, and prefaced with a notice of his life and works (London, 1826–36).

Bibliography: W. H. Cummings, *Purcell*, in *Great Musicians Series*, London, 1899; G. Grove, *Hist. of Music*, ii. 183, iii. 46–52, 5 vols., ib. 1879–89; J. F. Runciman, *Purcell*, New York, 1909; *DNB*, xlvii. 39–44.

PURCELL, JOHN BAPTIST: Roman Catholic archbishop; b. at Mallow (18 m. n.n.w. of Cork), County Cork, Ireland, Feb. 26, 1800; d. at St. Martens, Brown County, Ohio, July 4, 1883. He emigrated to America in 1818; studied theology in America and France; was ordained priest at Paris in 1826; returned to America, and was made professor in 1827, and president in 1828, of Mount St. Mary's College, Emmittsburg, Md. In 1833 he was consecrated bishop, and in 1850 archbishop, of Cincinnati. When he came to his see, there were only sixteen Roman Catholic churches in all Ohio, and many of these were mere sheds. In 1876 there were 460 churches, 100 chapels, 3 theological seminaries, 3 colleges, 6 hospitals, and 22 orphan asylums. In 1879, he, with his brother, failed for $4,000,000, whereupon he retired permanently to a monastery. He held public debates with Alexander Campbell and with Thomas Vickers, published respectively as *A Debate on the Roman Catholic Religion* (1837) and *The Vickers and Purcell Controversy* (New York, 1868). In the Vatican Council he spoke and voted against the infallibility dogma, though he later accepted it.

Bibliography: No biography of this prelate exists. Consult R. Gilmour, *Funeral Oration on Archbishop J. B. Purcell*, New York, 1883.

PURCHAS, JOHN: Church of England; b. at Cambridge July 14, 1823; d. at Brighton Oct. 18, 1872. He received his education at Christ College, Cambridge (B.A., 1844; M.A., 1847); was curate of Elsworth, Cambridgeshire, 1851–53, of Orwell in the same county, 1856–59, and of St. Paul's, Brighton, 1861–66; and perpetual curate of St. James' Chapel, Brighton, after 1866. His curacy in St. James' is significant because of the direct contribution which was made through it to the controversy concerning ritualism (see Ritualism) in the Anglican church. Purchas introduced the use of vestments such as the cope, chasuble, alb, biretta, etc., and used lighted candles on the altar, crucifixes, images, and holy water, together with processions, incense, and the like. He was accordingly (Nov. 27, 1869) charged before the court of arches with infringing the law of the established church; he did not appear to answer, giving as reasons his poverty, which prevented him from securing legal assistance, and ill-health. Decision was rendered against him Feb. 3, 1870, but in terms which did not please Col. Charles James Elphinstone, who had brought the suit. The latter appealed for a fuller condemnation, which was eventually obtained May 16, 1871, the decision going against Purchas in all points. Purchas had put his property out of his hands, and so could not be made to pay costs; moreover, he did not discontinue the illegal practises, and was suspended for twelve months; but in spite of this he continued his services until his death. The decision caused a controversy which extended over a considerable period and involved the leaders in the Anglican church.

Purchas' most important literary achievement was the editing of *Directorium Anglicanum: being a Manual of Directions for the right Celebration of the Holy Communion, for the Saying of Matins and Evensong, and for the Performance of the other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church* (London, 1858; a standard work on Anglican ritualism). He was also the author of a comedy, several poems, including *Poems and Ballads* (1846); *The Book of Feasts; Sermons* (1853); *The Priest's Dream: an Allegory* (1856); and *The Death of Ezekiel's Wife: Three Sermons* (1866).

Bibliography: *DNB*, xlvii. 44–45. The official reports of the trials are in *Law Reports, Admiralty and Ecclesiastical Courts*, 1872, iii. 66–113, and *Law Reports, Privy Council Appeals*, iii. 245–257, 605–702. Further comment is to be found in: G. Calthrop, *The Judgment in the Purchas Case*, London, 1871; R. Gregory, *The Purchas Judgment*, ib. 1871; H. P. Liddon, *The Purchas Judgment*, ib. 1871; T. W. Perry, *Notes on the Judgment of the . Privy Council in the Appeal Hebbert v. Purchas*, ib. 1877.

PURGATORY: The doctrine of purgatory is associated with that of the Intermediate State (q.v.). Its reference to fire was derived from the use of fire in the Bible as a symbol of purification (Mal. iii. 2; Matt. iii. 11; I Pet. i. 7) and of punishment (Matt. xxv. 41; Mark ix. 44, 49). The doctrine first began to be broached in the third century. Clement of Alexandria (*Pæd.*, iii., *Strom.*, vii.) speaks of a spiritual fire in this world; and Origen held that it continues beyond the grave (*Hom.* on Num. xxv.), even Paul and Peter must pass through it in order to be purified from all sin (*Hom.* on Ps. xxxvi.). Augustine, relying on Matt. xii. 32, regarded the doctrine of purgatorial fire for the cleansing away of the remnants of sin as not incredible. Gregory the Great (604) established the doctrine. Thomas Aquinas (*qu.* lxx. 3), Bonaventura (*Compendium theologiæ*, vii. 2), and Gerson (*Sermo*, ii., *De defunctis*), and other great men of the Middle Ages held that the fire of purgatory was material. At the Council of Florence (1439) the Greek church laid down the idea as one of the irreconcilable differences between them and the Latin church. The Cathari, the Waldenses, and Wyclif opposed the doctrine.

The teaching of the Greek Catholic Church is thus stated in the " Longer Catechism " (adopted 1839; cf. Schaff, *Creeds*, ii. 504):

> Q. 376. What is to be remarked of such souls as have departed with faith, but without having had time to bring forth fruits worthy of repentance? This, that they may be aided toward the attainment of a blessed resurrection by prayers offered in their behalf, especially such as are offered in union with the oblation of the bloodless sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ, and by works of mercy done in faith for their memory. Q. 377. On what is this doctrine

grounded? On the constant tradition of the Catholic Church, the sources of which may be seen even in the Church of the Old Testament. Judas Maccabæus offered sacrifices for his men that had fallen (II Macc. xii. 43). Prayer for the departed has ever formed a fixed part of the divine Liturgy, from the first Liturgy of the apostle James. St. Cyril of Jerusalem says, "Very great will be the benefit to those souls for which prayer is offered at the moment when the holy and tremendous sacrifice is lying in view" ("Mystagogical Lectures," v. 9). St. Basil the Great, in his Prayers for Pentecost, says that "the Lord vouchsafes to receive from us propitiatory prayers and sacrifices for those that are kept in Hades, and allows us the hope of obtaining for them peace, relief, and freedom."

The Roman Catholic doctrine is as follows (Schaff, *Creeds*, ii. 198–199):

> Whereas the Catholic Church, instructed by the Holy Ghost, has, from the Sacred Writings and the ancient tradition of the Fathers, taught in sacred councils, and very recently in this ecumenical synod, that there is a purgatory, and that the souls there detained are helped by the suffrages of the faithful, but principally by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar: the holy synod enjoins on bishops that they diligently endeavor that the sound doctrine concerning purgatory . . be believed, maintained, taught, and everywhere proclaimed by the faithful of Christ.

The doctrine was elaborated by Bellarmine (1621) in *De purgatorio*, in which proof was adduced from I Kings xxxi. 13; II Kings i., iii.; II Macc. xii. 40 sqq.; Tob. iv. 18; Matt. xii. 32; I Cor. iii. 11, and from the Fathers, the councils, and reason, and the conclusion is reached that the fire of purgatory is material (*ignem purgatorii esse corporeum*).

The doctrine of purgatory as now taught in the Roman Catholic Church is that souls which depart this life in a state of grace but guilty of venial sins or liable to some punishment after the guilt of sins is forgiven, are subject to a process of cleansing before entering heaven. The souls detained there are helped by the prayers of the faithful. These souls probably pray to God in behalf of those who are still known to them on the earth, and they inspire living men to offer prayer in their behalf. But what the location of the place is, what is the nature or quality of the pains, or the duration of the purifying process, or what the methods in which the mediation of the living is applied are questions to which the Church affords no answers. The difficulty that the detention of those who enter purgatory just previous to the final judgment is too short for purification, is met by the suggestion that pure spirits are not under ordinary conditions of time, and that all things are present together in the eternity of God.

C. A. Beckwith.

Bibliography: T. Wright, *St. Patrick's Purgatory*, London, 1843; J. Berington and J. Kirk, *Faith of the Catholics*, iii. 140, London, 1846; W. Palmer, *Dissertations on Orthodox Catholic Communion*, ib. 1853; W. Forbes, *Considerationes Modestæ*, vol. ii., ib. 1856; L. Redner, *Das Fegfeuer*, Regensburg, 1856; J. H. Oswald, *Eschatologie*, Paderborn, 1868; G. Williams, *Orthodox Church of the East in the 18th Century*, London, 1868; *Tracts for the Day*, ed. O. Shipley, vol. ii., ib. 1868; B. Jungmann, *De novissimis*, Regensburg, 1871; W. Barrows, *Purgatory doctrinally and historically Opened*, New York, 1882; J. Bautz, *Das Fegfeuer*, Mainz, 1883; W. Allen, *Souls Departed; a Defence of the Doctrine touching Purgatory*, republished, London, 1886; M. Canty, *Purgatory*, Dublin, 1886; J. Mumford, *Two Ancient Treatises on Purgatory*, London, 1893; Louvet, *Das Fegfeuer, nach den Offenbarungen der Heiligen*, Paderborn, 1895; S. J. Hunter, *Outlines of Dogmatic Theology*, §§ 551, 607, 711, 822, 829, New York, 1896; F. X. Schouppe, *Die Lehre von Fegfeuer*, Brixen, 1899; A. J. Mason, *Purgatory*, London, 1901; F. Schmid, *Das Fegfeuer nach katholische Lehre*, Brixen, 1904; *KL*, iv. 1284–96; and literature under Eschatology; Future Punishment; Intermediate State; and Probation, Future.

PURIFICATION. See Defilement and Purifications, Ceremonial.

PURIFICATION OF THE VIRGIN MARY, FEAST OF THE. See Mary, Mother of Jesus Christ, III.

PURIM. See Feasts and Festivals, I., § 5; Synagogue.

PURITANS, PURITANISM.

Motives of the First Puritans (§ 1).
Congregation at Frankfort and Geneva (§ 2).
Relations of Elizabeth and the Puritans (§ 3).
Repressive Measures (§ 4).
Growth of Puritanism; Thomas Cartwright (§ 5).
Attempts at Presbyterianism, 1572 (§ 6).
The "Prophesyings"; Archbishop Grindal (§ 7).
Archbishop Whitgift's Articles (§ 8).
Whitgift's Severity (§ 9).
Attitude of Parliament (§ 10).
The Marprelate Tracts; Brownists (§ 11).
James I.; Hampton Court Conference (§ 12).
Archbishop Bancroft; Puritan Emigration (§ 13).
The Puritans Calvinists (§ 14).
Charles I. Archbishop Laud (§ 15).

The Reformation in England was begun in the reign of Henry VIII. and consolidated in the reigns of Elizabeth and James I. It was unfortunate for religion and the Church that from the first the movement was subordinated to personal caprice and state policy. Most of the principal agents employed to effect it were zealous Protestants and desired that it should be thorough; and although at first unable to do all which they desired, they rejoiced in what they had been permitted to accomplish, and hoped that the work would continue to advance. But they were doomed to disappointment, and in the end submitted to what appeared to them to be "the inevitable."

1. Motives of the First Puritans.

The first Puritans were men who could not accept the work as complete or rest satisfied with it in its imperfection. They wished to make the Church as perfect an instrument as possible for promoting true religion, and therefore urged the utter rejection of everything that countenanced Roman error and superstition. They had no objection to the connection of the Church with the State, or to some control of it by the civil authorities. They submitted to those regulations which they approved, but, whether consistently or inconsistently, they resisted those which appeared to them inexpedient or contrary to the interests of Protestant truth. They were not actuated solely or chiefly, as has often been charged, by hostility to ecclesiastical government by bishops, but by the intense conviction that the hierarchy, as it was and as it seemed certain to remain, was destructive of the purity and truth of religion.

The spirit of Puritanism had appeared in the reign of Edward VI. Bishop Hooper refused to be consecrated in the papal vestments and to take the papal oath. The latter was altered, but the former could not be dispensed with. For his refusal he was imprisoned, but eventually compromised matters

by consenting to wear the vestments on high occasions only (see HOOPER, JOHN).

During the Marian persecution many English divines fled to the continent and several found an asylum in Frankfort, where, having obtained the use of a church on condition that they should subscribe the French confession of faith, they formed a society, chose John Knox and Thomas Leaver as their ministers, drew up a service-book for themselves, and proceeded in the path of reformation farther than it had yet been possible to do in England. Here they met with opposition from other exiles who had been invited to join them, who insisted on using the English liturgy and on conforming to the rites of the English Church as ordered in the reign of Edward VI. Troubles consequently arose, which disquieted the original company and finally caused it to remove to Geneva. The treatment these brethren met with at Frankfort was only an earnest of what they were to experience in England in the ensuing reign (cf. *A Brief Discourse of the Troubles at Frankfort 1554–1558 A.D. Attributed to William Whittingham, Dean of Durham, 1575 A.D.*, London, 1908).

2. Congregation at Frankfort and Geneva.

When Elizabeth ascended the throne, the exiles returned home, but, much to their sorrow, found the queen disposed to retrograde rather than to advance. Fond of pomp, she determined on preserving the vestments and some symbols of popery, alleging a desire to retain the Roman Catholics in the church; and, to aid in securing this object, some offensive passages in the service-book were removed and ceremonies which favored their opinions were retained. Elizabeth cordially disliked the Puritans, and therefore such men as Miles Coverdale and John Fox were treated with neglect. In the first year of her reign the Act of Supremacy and the Act of Uniformity were passed (see SUPREMACY, ACT OF; UNIFORMITY, ACTS OF), the latter of which pressed heavily upon the Puritans, who had scruples respecting the conformity required of them in vestments and forms. They held that certain vestments, having been used by the "idolatrous" priests of Rome, defiled and obscured the priesthood of Christ, that they increased hypocrisy and pride, that they were contrary to Scripture, and that the enforcement of them was tyranny. Many of the bishops would have been glad to dispense with them. But the queen insisted upon retaining them, and, as Hallam says, "Had her influence been withdrawn, surplices and square caps would have lost their steadiest friend, and several other little accommodations to the prevalent dispositions of Protestants would have taken place" (*Constitutional History*, chap. iv.). There is do doubt that Elizabeth, feeling the insecurity of her position and the magnitude of the dangers which encompassed her in the beginning of her reign, acted from policy and endeavored to mark out a *via media* between Protestantism and popery. This partly accounts for her severities toward the Puritans, who strongly opposed this course, but can not excuse them. The Puritans, on the other hand, were jealous for the honor of Christ, the true Head of the Church, and would conform to nothing which tended to endanger Protestant truth. They acted, moreover, under the advice of the continental Reformers, who urged them "not to hearken to the counsels of those men, who, when they saw that popery could not be honestly defended nor entirely restrained, would use all artifices to have the outward face of religion to remain *mixed, uncertain, and doubtful;* so that, while an evangelical religion is pretended, those things should be obtruded on the Church which will make the returning back to popery, superstition, and idolatry, easy." Rudolf Gualther, the writer of the advice, says, "We have had experience of this for some years in Germany, and know what influence such persons may have. I apprehend that in the first beginnings, while men may study to avoid the giving of small offense, many things may be suffered under this color for a little while; and yet it will scarce be possible, by all the endeavors that can be used, to get them removed, at least without great struggles." Later experience has proved the wisdom of this advice. The Puritans did not refuse to use the vestments as vestments merely, but as symbols; and their motto was *Obsta principiis.*

3. Relations of Elizabeth and the Puritans.

The parochial clergy at the commencement of Elizabeth's reign were almost entirely the Marian mass-priests who had conformed to the new order. Not more than 300 in the 10,000 parishes of England had vacated their livings; the rest had a great influence in the convocation of 1562, which met to review the doctrine and discipline of the Church. Notwithstanding this influence, Bishop Sandys introduced a petition for reformation, which went very far to satisfy the demands of the Puritans, and which was rejected only by the proxies of absentees, and then by a bare majority of one. This fact will show the strength of the Puritan party at that time. But, although so strong, the queen and her ecclesiastics determined to suppress it. The Court of High Commission, constituted by virtue of the royal supremacy, was empowered "to visit, reform, redress, order, correct, and amend all errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, contempts, offenses, and enormities whatsoever," and, with its oath *ex officio* (by which a man was compelled to testify against himself and to tell what he knew of others), was the means of inflicting extreme suffering on the Puritans. In order to insure uniformity "advertisements" (see ADVERTISEMENTS OF ELIZABETH) were issued by the bishops in 1566 (probably originally drawn up by Archbishop Parker in 1564), by which it was ordained that "all licenses for preaching, granted out by the archbishops and bishops within the province of Canterbury, bearing date before the first day of Mar., 1564, be void and of none effect." Thus all preachers were silenced. And, to complete the work, it was ordained that only "such as shall be thought meet for the office" should receive fresh licenses. Thus only conformable ministers were restored. Some of the best and most conscientious of the clergy were cast out of office and thousands of parishes were destitute and had no ministers to preach to them. This, however, in the estimation of the queen and her

4. Repressive Measures.

ecclesiastical advisers was a less evil than a ministry without the Roman Catholic vestments.

Archbishop Parker seconded the queen in all her severities, the consequence of which was that in 1567 some of the laity resolved to meet privately and to worship God as the Protestants did in Queen Mary's days. About 100 of them met in Plumbers' Hall in London. But they were surprised and some were apprehended and imprisoned for more than a year. These rigorous measures tended rather to the increase of Puritanism than to its destruction. The people continued to meet privately and the clergy began to look beyond the vestments and to question the constitution of the Church itself. Their leader was Thomas Cartwright, who, as Margaret professor of divinity at Cambridge, unfolded his views of ecclesiastical order, which were in harmony with those of the Presbyterian churches on the continent and in Scotland. A severe controversy hereupon arose. Cartwright was deprived of his professorship and fellowship, and was forbidden to teach or to preach. He retired to Geneva, where he was chosen professor of divinity; but he afterward returned to England. In 1571 John Field and Thomas Wilcox (two ministers of the Puritan party) prepared the famous *Admonition to Parliament for the Reformation of Church Discipline*. They presented it themselves, and for doing so were committed to prison. Whitgift replied to the admonition, and took the Erastian ground, which Hooker afterward maintained, that no form of church order is laid down in the New Testament, and that the government in the apostles' days can not now be exercised. Cartwright, who had published *A Second Admonition*, was chosen to reply to Whitgift. Both his books gave such offense to the queen and archbishop that it was resolved to try him, but he escaped to Heidelberg. During Cartwright's exile, Whitgift published his *Defence of the Answer to the Admonition;* and Cartwright then published his *Second Reply*. This exile continued eleven years, after which Cartwright returned home to experience yet further molestation and suffering (see CARTWRIGHT, THOMAS; WHITGIFT, JOHN).

5. Growth of Puritanism; Thomas Cartwright.

It has been frequently said, that in 1572 a Presbyterian church was formed at Wandsworth; Field, the lecturer of Wandsworth, being the first minister, and Travers and Wilcox among the founders. The facts are, that the first distinct practical movement to secure a Presbyterian organization began with a secret meeting at that place. Wilcox and Field convened a few of their ministerial brethren and others to sketch an outline of the ecclesiastical polity which they wished to see in operation. Some of their papers fell into the hands of Bancroft, from which it appears that the only presbytery erected was on paper and was immediately demolished by Bancroft. Field and Wilcox were thrown into prison. The leaders of the party succumbed, and their meetings were discontinued (cf. J. Waddington, *Surrey Congregational History*, p. 5, London, 1866).

6. Attempts at Presbyterianism, 1572.

In 1575 Archbishop Parker died and was succeeded by Grindal. He found the country morally and religiously in a deplorable condition in consequence of the ignorance and incapacity of so many of its clergy. This state of things did not distress the queen, for she thought one or two preachers in a diocese enough; but the Puritans thought otherwise. In the year 1571 these clergy, in some districts, with the permission of the bishop, engaged in religious exercises called "prophesyings," which were meetings at whieh short sermons were preached on subjects previously fixed. These were good exercises for the clergy and cultivated the art of preaching. The laity were admitted and derived instruction and benefit from them. In 1574 Parker told the queen that they were only auxiliaries to Puritanism and Non-conformity, whereupon she gave him private orders to suppress them. When Grindal became archbishop of Canterbury, he inherited not only that office but also the task of suppressing the prophesyings; but, approving of them, he set himself rather to redress irregularities and to guard them against abuse. The queen, on the other hand, disliked them, and determined that they should be suppressed. On Dec. 20, 1576, Grindal wrote a respectful but faithful letter to the queen, in which he said, "I am forced with all humility, and yet plainly, to profess that I can not with safe conscience, and without the offense of the majesty of God, give my assent to the suppressing of the said exercises: much less can I send out any injunction for the utter and universal subversion of the same." For this boldness, Grindal was suspended, his see was placed under sequestration for six months, and he was confined to his house.

7. The "Prophesyings"; Archbishop Grindal.

Grindal died in 1583, and was succeeded by Whitgift, who, during the first week of his archiepiscopal rule, issued his famous articles:

"(1) That all preaching, catechising, and praying in any private house, where any are present besides the family, be utterly extinguished. (2) That none do preach or catechise, except also he will read the whole service, and administer the sacraments four times a year. (3) That all preachers, and others in ecclesiastical orders, do at all times wear the habits prescribed. (4) That none be admitted to preach, unless he be ordained according to the manner of the Church of England. (5) That none be admitted to preach, or execute any part of the ecclesiastical function, unless he subscribe the following articles: (a) That the queen hath, and ought to have, the sovereignty and rule over all manner of persons born within her dominions, of what condition soever they be; and that none other power or potentate hath, or ought to have, any power, ecclesiastical or civil, within her realms or dominions. (b) That the Book of Common Prayer, and of ordering bishops, priests, and deacons, containeth in it nothing contrary to the word of God, but may be lawfully used; and that he himself will use the same, and none other, in public prayer, and administration of the sacraments. (c) That he alloweth the Book of Articles agreed upon in the Convocation holden in London in 1562, and set forth by her Majesty's authority; and he believe all the articles therein contained to be agreeable to the word of God."

8. Archbishop Whitgift's Articles.

It is not surprising to find that, wielding almost absolute power with a despotic severity, Whitgift suspended many hundred clergy from their ministry. Petitions and remonstrances were in vain. And for twenty years this man guided the affairs

of the Established Church. Only the records of the High Commission Court can tell the havoc he made, and the misery he inflicted on some of the holiest of the clergy and the people of their charge. A new commission was issued at his instigation. Its jurisdiction was almost universal, embracing heretical opinions, seditious books, false rumors, slanderous words, abstaining from divine service, etc. A jury might be dispensed with, and the court might convict by witnesses alone; if they were wanting, "by all other means and ways they could devise,"—by the rack and *ex-officio* oath, etc.; and, if the oath were declined, then the court might inflict "fine or imprisonment according to its discretion." Whitgift drew up twenty-four articles to guide the commissioners when examining delinquent clergymen. The privy council remonstrated with him, and Lord Burleigh described the articles thus: "I find them so curiously penned, so full of branches and circumstances, that I think the Inquisition of Spain use not so many questions to comprehend and entrap their preys." Whitgift's reply was that he had undertaken the defense of the rights of the Church of England to appease the sects and schisms therein, and to reduce all the ministers thereof to uniformity and due obedience. "And herein," said he, "I intend to be constant, and not to waver with every wind." And so persistent was he that at one time, toward the close of Elizabeth's reign and of his life, no less than a third of the whole beneficed clergy of England were suspended; and this involved at least destitution and penury. The story of Cartwright's troubles given in more extended histories is a sad illustration of the spirit of Whitgift's rule. Cartwright died Dec. 27, 1603, and Whitgift within three months after.

9. Whitgift's Severity.

Parliament on several occasions manifested a disposition to legislate for the relief of the Puritans. In 1570 they enacted that ministers who had received Presbyterian ordination might qualify for service in the English Church by declaring before the bishop, and subscribing their assent "to all articles of religion which only concern the confession of the true Christian faith and the doctrine of the sacraments contained in the Book of Articles, 1562." Many of the Puritans attempted to shelter themselves under this act, but in vain. When, in 1572, Field and Wilcox presented their *Admonition* and Parliament lent an ear, the queen issued a proclamation against it, and forbade Parliament to discuss such questions as were mooted in it. Again, in 1584, 1587, and 1592, the queen interfered, and at length charged the speaker "that henceforth no bills concerning religion should be received into the House of Commons, unless the same should be first considered and approved of by the clergy"; well knowing that the clergy would only act in such a matter under her direction. Peter Wentworth remonstrated in the House against this dictation, but only to be committed to prison. In 1592 an act was passed, entitled "An Act for the Punishment of Persons obstinately Refusing to Come to Church." It was decreed that "all persons above the age of sixteen, refusing to come to church, or persuading others to deny her Majesty's authority in causes ecclesiastical, or dissuading them from coming to church, or being found present at any conventicle or meeting, under pretense of religion, shall, upon conviction, be committed to prison without bail till they shall conform, and come to church"; and that, should they refuse to recant, "within three months, they shall abjure the realm, and go into perpetual banishment; and that if they do not depart within the time appointed, or if they ever return without the queen's license, they shall suffer death without benefit of clergy." Under the provisions of this cruel act, Barrow, Greenwood, Penry (qq.v.), and others suffered death, and many of the Brownists left the kingdom.

10. Attitude of Parliament.

The Puritans themselves were not always wise or moderate in the expression of their sentiments. The oppression to which they were subjected was severe enough to goad them often to the use of strong language. But in 1588 a series of tracts was issued from a secret press, by an unknown writer who called himself Martin Marprelate (see MARPRELATE TRACTS). They were bitter and caustic, excited the wrath of the bishops, and brought down further afflictions upon the heads of the Puritans, although it is probable that the Puritans properly so called had nothing to do with them. Indeed, many Puritans greatly disapproved of them and regretted their publication. They possibly had their origin among the Brownists (see BROWNE, ROBERT), whose opinions and practises were even more obnoxious to the bishops than those of the ordinary Puritans. These Brownists may be classed among the Puritans, and by many persons are confounded with them; but they were a distinct species of the order, and during the latter part of the reign of Elizabeth they suffered the severest afflictions.

11. The Marprelate Tracts; Brownists.

Elizabeth died on the last day of 1602, and James VI. of Scotland succeeded her. The Puritans hoped that from him they would receive milder treatment. He had praised the Scottish Kirk, and disparaged the Church of England, saying that "its service was but an evil-said mass in English, wanting nothing but the liftings." But Whitgift had sent agents to Scotland to assure the king of the devotion of the English ecclesiastics to his interests; and he, in return, gave them his patronage entirely. The Puritans presented a petition to him, when on his way to London, unsigned but expressing the wishes of about a thousand clergymen, and therefore called the "Millenary Petition" (q.v.). In it they set forth in moderate language their desires. And now a fair opportunity presented itself for conciliation. A conference was resolved upon, which assembled at Hampton Court, Jan. 14, 1604, professedly to give due consideration to these matters (see HAMPTON COURT CONFERENCE). On the first day the king and the episcopal party alone went over the ground, and settled what was to be done. The next day four Puritan ministers—John Reynolds (q.v.), Dr. Sparks, Mr. Chadderton, and Mr. Knewstubs—

12. James I.; Hampton Court Conference.

were called into the privy council chamber, where they expressed their desires, and explained and enforced the Puritan objections. On the third day the king and the bishops at first conferred by themselves, and, after they had settled matters, the four Puritans were again called in and told what had been decided. The king said that he expected of them obedience and humility, and added, "if this be all that they have to say, I shall make them conform themselves, or I will harry them out of the land, or else do worse." And so the opportunity for conciliation was lost, and then severities were resumed.

13. Archbishop Bancroft; Puritan Emigration.

In 1604 the constitutions and canons of the church were settled in convocation, and, without receiving the assent of Parliament, were issued on the strength of the royal supremacy alone. They were conceived in a rigorous spirit and dealt freely in excommunication, which at that time was not a mere *brutum fulmen*. Bancroft, bishop of London, presided at this convocation, as Whitgift was now dead; and he was afterward raised to the archbishopric of Canterbury. In his new office he even surpassed Whitgift in his severities. Three hundred Puritan ministers, who had not separated from the Established Church, were silenced, imprisoned, or exiled in 1604. "But, the more they afflicted them, the more they multiplied and grew." And now the persecuted pastors and people began to think of emigrating. The Separatists went to Holland—Smyth to Amsterdam in 1606, and John Robinson with the Scrooby church to Amsterdam and Leyden in 1608–1609. Some of the Puritans also sailed for Virginia, whereupon the archbishop obtained a proclamation forbidding others to depart without the king's license. And so severe was the persecution which they endured that Parliament in 1610 endeavored to relieve them, but with little success. Bancroft died this year, being succeeded by George Abbot, and still persecution continued. In 1618 the king published his *Declaration for Sports on the Lord's Day*. The controversy on the observance of the Sabbath began in the latter part of Elizabeth's reign. Dr. Nicholas Bound published his *True Doctrine of the Sabbath*, contending for a strict observance of the day; and Whitgift opposed it. The Puritans adopted its positions, but the court clergy rejected them, and now the *Book of Sports* became the shibboleth of the party. All ministers were enjoined to read it in their congregations, and those who refused were suspended and imprisoned.

14. The Puritans Calvinists.

The doctrines of the Reformers and of their successors, Conformists and Puritans alike, had been hitherto Calvinistic. Whitgift was a High Calvinist; the king, who prided himself on his theology, had maintained Calvinism; and the representatives of England at the Synod of Dort were of the same opinions. But a change came over the Established clergy and many began to set forth Arminianism [or, rather a semi-Pelagianism of the Roman Catholic type]. The Puritans held fast to the old faith and now in 1620 were forbidden to preach it. And from this time and through the primacy of Laud, Puritan doctrine, as well as Puritan practise, was obnoxious to those in power.

15. Charles I.; Archbishop Laud.

James died in 1625, and was succeeded by Charles I. Under this monarch "the unjust and inhuman proceedings of the Council Table, the Star Chamber, and the High Commission, are unparalleled." Non-conformists were exceedingly harassed and persecuted in every corner of the land. These severities were instigated by Laud, soon after made bishop of London, and prime minister to the king. Lecturers were put down, and such as preached against Arminianism and the Popish ceremonies were suspended. The Puritans were driven from one diocese to another, and many were obliged to leave the kingdom. In 1633 Laud succeeded to the archbishopric of Canterbury, on the death of Abbot, when the Puritans felt the whole force of his fiery zeal; and during the next seven years multitudes of them, ministers and laymen, were driven to Holland and America. The *Book of Sports* was republished, with like consequences as at the first publication. William Prynne (q.v.), Burton, and Bastwick suffered their horrible punishments. Ruinous fines were imposed, superstitious rites and ceremonies were practised and enjoined, and the whole church appeared to be going headlong to Rome. In 1640 the Convocation adopted new constitutions and canons, extremely superstitious and tyrannical, which the Long Parliament condemned as being "contrary to the fundamental laws of the realm and to the liberty and property of the subject, and as containing things tending to sedition and dangerous consequence." The nation could bear the unmitigated political and ecclesiastical tyranny no longer. Those who had suffered from the king's arbitrary rule joined with those who were groaning under the despotism of the bishops, and with one vast effort overthrew absolute monarchy and Anglican popery together. A new era now commenced. Puritanism properly so called had ended; for the Puritans split into two parties, Independents and Presbyterians. For the further history see CONGREGATIONALISTS; PRESBYTERIANS; WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY; see also the biographical notices of men named in this article and others prominent in the Puritan time, as CROMWELL, OLIVER; MILTON, JOHN.

(JOHN BROWNE†.) MORTON DEXTER†.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: For sources consult: S. R. Gardiner: *Constitutional Documents of the Puritan Revolution*, London, 1890 (a most useful and fundamental book), cf. P. Bayne, *Documents Relating to the Settlement of the Church of England by the Act of Uniformity*, ib. 1862; R. G. Usher, *Presbyterian Movement in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth as illustrated by the Minute Book of the Dedham Classis, 1582–1589*, ib. 1905 (traces the Puritan attempt to introduce modifications into the Church of England); W. Bradford, *Hist. of Plymouth Plantation, 1605–46*, ed. W. T. Davis, New York, 1908.

For the history consult: B. Brook, *Lives of the Puritans*, 3 vols., London, 1813; D. Neal, *History of the Puritans*, best edition by J. Toulmin, 5 vols., Bath, 1822, ed. also by J. O. Choules, New York, 1863 (the great classic); E. Hall, *The Puritans and their Principles*, New York, 1846; W. H. Stowell, *Hist. of the Puritans in England*, London, 1849, new ed., 1878, New York, 1887; J. B. Marsden, *Hist. of the Puritans to 1662*, 2 vols., London, 1850–52; J. Tulloch, *English Puritan-*

ism and its Leaders, Edinburgh, 1861; S. Hopkins, *Puritans of the Reigns of Edward VI. and Elizabeth*, 3 vols., ib. 1862; W. C. Martyn, *The Great Reformation*, vol. iv., *History of the English Puritans*, New York, 1868; L. Bacon, *Genesis of the New England Churches*, ib. 1874; H. O. Wakeman, *The Church and the Puritans, 1570–1660*, London, 1877, new ed., 1887; C. E. Ellis, *The Puritan Age and Rule in the Colony of Massachusetts Bay, 1629–85*, Boston, 1888; D. Campbell, *The Puritan in England, Holland and America*, New York, 1892; John Brown, *The Pilgrim Fathers of New England, and their Puritan Successors*, ib. 1895; J. Gregory, *Puritanism in the Old World and the New*, ib. 1896; O. P. Temple, *The Covenanter, Cavalier and Puritan*, ib. 1897; E. H. Byington, *The Puritan as a Colonist and Reformer*, Boston, 1899; idem, *The Puritan in England and New England*, ib. 1900; E. Dowden, *Puritan and Anglican. Studies in Literature*, London, 1900; C. H. Firth, *Oliver Cromwell and the Rule of the Puritans in England*, New York, 1900; H. M. and Morton Dexter, *The England and Holland of the Puritans*, Boston, 1905 ("contains a mass of trustworthy information"); S. R. Maitland, *Reformation in England*, ib. 1906 (chaps. i.–ii. deal with Puritanism); S. C. Beach, *Daughters of the Puritans*, ib. 1907; E. B. Hulbert, *The English Reformation and Puritanism*, Chicago, 1907; I. W. Riley, *American Philosophy; the early Schools*, pp. 37 sqq., New York, 1907; J. Heron, *A Short Hist. of Puritanism*, ib. 1908; J. E. Kirkbye, *Puritanism in the South*, Boston, 1909; A Schalck de la Faverie, *Les Premiers Interprétes de la pensée americaine. Essai d'hist. et de litterature sur l'évolution du puritanisme aux États-Unis*, Paris, 1909; Winnifred Cockshott, *The Pilgrim Fathers: their Church and Colony*, New York, 1910; B. Blaxford, *The Struggle with Puritanism*, London, 1910; J. H. Burn, *The struggle* [of the Church of England] *with Puritanism*, ib. 1910; J. Brown, *The English Puritans*, ib. 1910; R. G. Usher, *The Reconstruction of the English Church*, 2 vols., New York, 1910.

PURVES, GEORGE TYBOUT: Presbyterian; b. in Philadelphia Sept. 27, 1852; d. in New York Sept. 24, 1901. He was a graduate of the University of Pennsylvania (1872) and of Princeton Theological Seminary (1876); was pastor of the Presbyterian church at Wayne, Pa., 1877–80; of the Boundary Avenue Presbyterian Church, Baltimore, 1880–1886; of the first Presbyterian Church, Pittsburg, 1886–92; professor of New-Testament literature and exegesis in Princeton Theological Seminary, 1892–1900; and pastor of the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York City, from 1900 till his death. He was the author of *The Testimony of Justin Martyr to Early Christianity* (Stone lectures for 1899 at Princeton Theological Seminary; New York, 1899); *Christianity in the Apostolic Age* (1900); *Joy in Service* (sermons; 1901); *Faith and Life* (sermons; 1902); and *The Sinless Christ* (sermons; 1902).

PURVES, JAMES: Scotch sectary; b. at Blackadder (10 m. w. of Berwick upon Tweed) Sept. 23, 1734; d. at Edinburgh Feb. 1 (or 15), 1795. His father was a shepherd, and the son in 1755 united with a religious society belonging to certain "fellowship societies" founded in Berwickshire by a James Fraser, connected with the "Reformed presbytery" from 1743 to 1753. After reading Isaac Watts' *Dissertation on the Logos* he adopted the doctrine of the preexistence of the human soul of Christ; gaining influence in the societies, he was sent as a commissioner to Ireland to certain societies there of like faith. Meanwhile the societies were without a stated ministry, but in 1769 Purves was selected by lot to prepare for this work. He was sent to Glasgow College in 1769, where he gained some knowledge of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. In 1771 a statement of the theology of the societies was drawn up by Purves, involving Arian positions and free examination of the Scriptures untrammelled by creeds. In 1776 one of these socicties was founded in Edinburgh, and Purves was called as pastor, and in 1792 the name "Universalist Dissenters" was adopted. The congregations were small, but Purves supplemented his pulpit work by a considerable literary activity, printing himself some of the tracts which embodied his views, even casting the Hebrew type. He issued in all about twenty publications, of which the most important are *A Short Abstract of the Principles of the United Societies in Scotland* (n.p., 1771); *Observations on Prophetic Times and Similitudes* (2 parts, Edinburgh, 1777–1778); *A Hebrew Grammar without Points* (Edinburgh, 1779; has some very excellent qualities); *An Humble Attempt to Investigate the Scripture Doctrine concerning the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit* (1784); *An Humble Enquiry into Faith and Regeneration* (1788); *Observations on the Visions of the Apostle John* (2 vols., 1789–93); and *A Declaration of the Religious Opinions of the Universalist Dissenters* (1793).

Bibliography: A memoir by T. C. Holland is printed in the *Monthly Repository*, 1820, pp. 77 sqq.; *DNB*, xlvii. 50–51.

PURVEY, JOHN: Reviser of the Wyclif translation of the Bible; b. about 1354; d. about 1428. He was from Lathbury (5 m. s. of Olney); was probably educated at Oxford; associated with John Wyclif at Lutterworth for some time before 1384, and after Wyclif's death became a leader of the Lollard party; he preached at Bristol, but was silenced in Aug., 1387, by the Bishop of Worcester. In 1390 he was in prison, and while there compiled from Wyclif's writings a commentary on Revelation. In 1400 he recanted his Lollardy at St. Paul's Cross, London; was by the archdeacon of Canterbury admitted to the vicarage of West Hythe, Kent, but resigned Oct. 8, 1403, and was again in prison in 1421. He is chiefly remembered for his revision of Wyclif's and Nicholas Hereford's translation of the Bible, which he completed in 1388 (see Bible Versions, B, IV., § 2). To this revision he wrote a prologue of great length and interest. He was also the author of *Remonstrances against Romish Corruptions in the Church, Addressed to the People and Parliament of England in 1395* (ed. J. Forshall, London, 1851).

Bibliography: T. Netter, *Fasciculi zizaniorum*, ed. W. H. Shirley, pp. lxviii., 383, 400–407, London, 1858; Wyclif's *New Testament in English*, ed. J. Forshall and F. Madden, vol. i., Oxford, 1850, new ed., 1879; J. I. Mombert, *Hand-Book of the English Versions of the Bible*, pp. 45, 55–57, New York, 1883; G. V. Lechler, *John Wycliffe and his English Precursors*, pp. 220, 407, 452–453, new ed., London, 1884; W. W. Capes, *The English Church in the 14th and 15th Centuries*, passim, ib. 1900; G. M. Trevelyan, *England in the Age of Wycliffe*, pp. 224–225, Philadelphia, 1907; J. Gairdner, *Lollardy and the Reformation in England*, i. 52, 59, 116, 195, London, 1908; *DNB*, xlvii. 51–52.

PUSEY, EDWARD BOUVERIE: Church of England tractarian; b. at Pusey (12 m. s.w. of Oxford) Aug. 22, 1800; d. at Ascot Priory, Oxford, Sept. 16, 1882. He was the second son of the first Viscount Folkestone, Jacob Bouverie, descending

from the old Huguenot family of Bouverie. At the age of eighteen he entered Christ Church College, Oxford, and in 1824 was elected fellow at Oriel College, where he became intimately acquainted with J. H. Newman and John Keble. He studied oriental languages, but after a prolonged stay in Germany (1825–27, in Göttingen, Berlin, and Bonn) devoted himself to the study of German theology. By his work on this subject, *Historical Enquiry into the Probable Causes of the Rationalistic Character Predominant in the Theology of Germany* (London, 1828–30) he attracted the attention of academic circles, so that the duke of Wellington in 1829 made him regius professor of Hebrew and canon of Christ Church.

In 1833 the *Tracts for the Times* (see TRACTARIANISM) had begun to appear and caused a great sensation. Although Pusey was in contact with the circle from which they proceeded, it was only with his treatise on baptism, *Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism* (nos. 67–69 of *Tracts for the Times*, 1835) and the publication of the *Library of the Fathers* (see below) that he, at the end of 1834, joined the forces of High-churchism which after that formed the purpose and task of his life. He exercised a great and decisive influence upon the character and events of the movement, but was not responsible for the foundation of the new party. He threw himself into the study of the Fathers and of those "Anglicans" who in the seventeenth century had not succeeded in realizing their idea that the "old church," i.e., the medieval Church, in spite of Roman deformations, had been the only true expression of the Church of Christ, and from these studies Pusey's ideas of the Church received a decisive influence. In this spirit he, together with Keble and Newman, edited, after 1836, the *Oxford Library of the Fathers of the Holy Catholic Church, Anterior to the Division of the East and West* (50 vols., Oxford, 1838–85). In a lecture on the Book of Common Prayer he asserted, long before Newman, that many "genuinely Catholic" doctrines might be upheld even with the acknowledgment of the Thirty-nine Articles. In 1843 Pusey, in a sermon, stated views which, deviating from the conception of the sacrament current since the Reformation, closely approached the medieval sacrificial idea of the real presence. In consequence he was deposed from his office as preacher. The news of his deposition created such a sensation that Pusey advanced to a leading position in the struggle of the church, and the movement was characterized by the name of Puseyism.

As in his sermons, so in his theological investigations Pusey was held in check by a forced conservatism that strove to awaken forgotten ideals. Although he possessed great gifts as a polemical writer, he was not a profound theologian. His thought lacked consistence and keenness, but in the knowledge of ecclesiastical antiquities he excelled most of his contemporaries. In directing his eye to the past, he could not comprehend the modern spirit. His theology found adherents only until the sixties. Some of his disciples turned away from him, others went beyond him. His efforts at harmony with Rome and the renewal of the medieval conception of the sacrament, coinciding with the awakening of the medieval ideal of art upon English soil (Preraffaelites), led in natural consequence to a renewal of medieval ceremonies in worship. Although Pusey himself, ignoring the import of his own thoughts, vigorously protested against such a renewal, he could not hinder the renewal of ceremonies from becoming the shibboleth of his party, or Puseyism from being lost in ritualism.

The fundamental traits of his theology Pusey laid down in a number of works which in almost every instance were destined to serve the ecclesiastical questions of the day. The most important are: *The Doctrine of the Real Presence, as contained in the Fathers* (Oxford, 1855); *The Real Presence the Doctrine of the English Church* (1857); *The Minor Prophets, with Commentary* (5 parts, 1860; reissue, London, 1906 sqq.). In the work called *Eirenicon* (vol. i., 1865) *The Church of England a Portion of Christ's One Holy Catholic Church, and a Means of Restoring Visible Unity*, he tried to show the ecclesiastical theological foundations of a union with Rome on the basis of the Council of Trent. In the second volume of the same work, *The Reverential Love Due to the Ever-blessed Theotokos and the Doctrine of her Immaculate Conception* (1869), and in the third volume, *Is Healthful Reunion Possible?* (1870), both addressed to J. H. Newman in the form of letters, he pursued the idea of union still further and tried to remove the difficulties between England and Rome as being of little account by the assumption of the Gallican principles of Bossuet. The third *Eirenicon* Pusey sent to the majority of bishops assembled at the Vatican, but it was rejected, and the subsequent triumph of Ultramontanism (1870) completely destroyed his hopes of reconciliation. Besides several collections of sermons, *Parochial Sermons* (4 vols., 1832–50); *University Sermons* (3 vols., 1864–79); and *Lenten Sermons* (1858, 1874), and other works, Pusey published: *Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister* and *God's Prohibition of the Marriage with a Deceased Wife's Sister* (1849, 1860); *The Royal Supremacy not an Arbitrary Authority* (1850); *The Councils of the Church* (1857); *Daniel the Prophet* (1864); *On the Clause: "And the Son"* (1876); *Habitual Confession not Discouraged* (1878); *What is of Faith as to Everlasting Punishment* (1880).

(RUDOLF BUDDENSIEG†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The principal biography is by H. P. Liddon, 4 vols., London, 1893–97. Consult further: A. B. Donaldson, *Five Great Oxford Leaders*, ib. 1902; C. C. Grafton, *Pusey and the Church Revival*, Milwaukee, 1902; G. W. E. Russell, *Dr. Pusey*, London, 1907; *DNB*, xlvii. 53–61. Much of the literature under the articles on Cardinals Manning and Newman and on Tractarianism will be found pertinent. The bibliography of Pusey's works and those evoked by his activities covers seven pages in the *British Museum Catalogue*.

PYNCHON, WILLIAM: English colonist in America and religious author; b. at Springfield (28 m. n.e. of London), Essex, in 1590; d. at Wraysbury (3 m. s.e. of Windsor), Buckingshamshire, Oct. 29, 1662. He was probably educated at Cambridge; was one of the original patentees of the Massachusetts Bay Company, 1629; came to America, 1630; settled at Roxbury, Mass.; founded Springfield on the Connecticut River, 1636, naming it for his Eng-

lish home. Visiting England he published *The Meritorious Price of our Redemption* (London, 1650) controverting the Calvinistic view of the atonement. The heresies it contained (that Christ did not suffer for man the torments of hell, nor bear man's sins, nor the curse of the law for them, and therefore did not redeem mankind by suffering that curse) aroused great consternation in Massachusetts Bay Colony and upon his return the general court condemned the book to be burned by the executioner and cited Pynchon to appear before it in May, 1651. He acknowledged the order by answering in a letter that he had been entirely misunderstood; but he was summoned again in Oct., 1651, and again in May, 1652. He ignored both orders, and, leaving his children, he returned to England, Sept., 1652. He further published *Meritorious Price of our Redemption* (1655), revised with a rejoinder to the answer of John Morton, *A Further Discussion of . . . the Sufferings of Christ* (1653); *The Jewes Synagogue* (1652); *How the First Sabbath was Ordained* (1654); and *The Covenant of Nature Made with Adam* (1662).

Bibliography: *Massachusetts Historical Collections*, 2 ser., vol. viii., 10 vols., Boston, 1814–23; J. G. Palfrey, *History of New England*, ii. 395–396, 4 vols., New York, 1858–75; H. M. Dexter, *The Congregationalism of the Last 300 Years as seen in its Literature*, Appendix, nos. 1552, 1638, 1642, 1705, ib. 1880; F. H. Foster, *Genetic Hist. of New England Theology*, pp. 16–20, 114, Chicago, 1907; *DNB*, xlvii. 85.

PYX. See Vessels, Sacred, § 3.

Q

QUADRAGESIMA. See Lent; Sunday.

QUADRATUS, cwod-rā'tus: The earliest Christian apologist. The only source is Eusebius, in his *Chronicon*, and in *Hist. eccl.*, IV., iii., I., ii. According to this authority Quadratus claimed to be a disciple of the apostles, and that, to furnish to his brethren in the faith a defense against the false charges brought by the heathen, he wrote a learned defense of Christianity which he forwarded to the Emperor Hadrian (q.v.; 117–138). The passage in the *Chronicon* runs as follows: "Quadratus, a disciple of the apostles and Aristides, a presbyter of Athens, composed and sent to Hadrian books in favor of the Christian religion." The same fact is stated in the "History" in practically the same words. Though Eusebius declares "the apology is still current among very many of the brethren," only one meager fragment has survived (cited in his *Hist. eccl.*, IV., iii.; Eng. transl. in *NPNF*, 2 ser. i. 175).

The question has been raised whether Quadratus the apologist is the same person as Quadratus the prophet mentioned by Eusebius in *Hist. eccl.*, III., xxxvii., as Otto, Zahn, and Hilgenfeld have contended. The chronology favors the identification. The mention of the prophet by Eusebius follows immediately after his report of the speech of Ignatius of Antioch, whose martyrdom took place under Trajan, or perhaps under Hadrian. And Harnack, who was formerly against the identification, in his *Litteratur* (i. 96) grants the probability. Eusebius also mentions (*Hist. eccl.*, IV., xxiii.) a Quadratus who was elected bishop of Athens as successor to the martyr Publius. In two passages of his works (*De vir. ill.*, xix., Eng. transl. in *NPNF*, 2 ser., iii. 367–368; and *Epist.*, lxx., Eng. transl. in *NPNF*, 2 ser., vi. 150) Jerome speaks of the bishop of Athens as identical with the apologist. But chronology is against this identification. The apologist, according to the passage from Eusebius cited above, flourished in the time of Hadrian, and the Athenian bishop appears, according to the same author, to have been a contemporary of Bishop Dionysius of Corinth and the Emperor Marcus Aurelius. A. Harnack (*Litteratur*, i. 95–96) declares "The statement of Jerome on this point is unworthy of credit," and Bardenhewer and others agree with him.

(Franz Görres.)

Bibliography: A. Harnack, in *TU*, i. 1–2 (1882), 100–114; idem, *Litteratur*, i. 95–96, ii. 1, pp. 269–271; T. Zahn, in *NKZ*, ii (1891), 281–287; idem, *Forschungen*, vi (1900), 41–53; Bardenhewer, *Geschichte*, i. 168–171; *DCB*, iv. 523.

QUADRILATERAL: A name given to four articles, adopted as a basis of Christian union by the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church at Chicago in 1886 and by the Lambeth Conference in 1888. See Fundamental Doctrines of Christianity, II., § 11; Lambeth Conference.

QUAKERS. See Friends.

QUARLES, cwōrlz: Name of writers of sacred poetry.

1. Francis Quarles was born at the manor-house of Stewards at Romford (12 m. n.e. of London) May 8, 1592; d. at London Sept. 8, 1644. He was educated at Christ Church, Cambridge (B.A., 1608), studied law at Lincoln's Inn· was cup-bearer to Princess Elizabeth on her marriage to the elector palatine in 1613; became secretary to James Ussher, archbishop of Armagh, Ireland, in 1629 lived in retirement at Roxwell, Essex, 1633–39· and was chronologer to the city of London, 1639–1644, with residence in that city. He was a stanch royalist and in the revolution his manuscripts were destroyed. His first attempts at verse were Biblical paraphrases such as *A Feast of Wormes set forth in a Poeme of the History of Jonah*, published with *Hymne to God* and *Pentelogia* (London, 1620), *Hadassa: History of Queen Esther* (1621), *Job Militant* (1624), *Sion's Elegies wept by Jeremie the Prophet* (1624), *Sion's Sonnets sung by Solomon the King* (1625), and *Historie of Samson* (1631); all of which were bound together with an *Alphabet of Elegies* (1625) in one volume entitled *Divine Poems* (London, 1633 and often). The work which won him immediate and phenomenal popularity was *Emblemes* (1635, 1634); it was issued in five books, the forty-five prints in the last three of which, as well as the verses either translated or

closely paraphrased, were from Hermann Hugo's *Pia Desideria Emblematis* (Antwerp, 1624). This was followed by *Hieroglyphikes of the Life of Man* (1638). The last two were published together (1736, and often). His *Divine Fancies, Digested into Epigrams, Meditations and Observations* in four books (1632), and his metrical version of six Psalms (xvi., xxv., li., lxxxviii., cxiii., and cxxxvii.) to be taken out to John Winthrop and John Cotton in America were published in the *Bay Psalm Book* (q.v.). The fruit of his retirement in London (1639–44) consisted of prose manuals of piety, the first of which, *Enchiridion, Containing Institutions Divine and Moral* (300 essays, 1640; 400 essays, 1641; and numerous other editions) was almost as popular as the *Emblems*. It was followed by *Barnabas and Boanerges; or Wine and Oyle for afflicted Soules* (1644), and *Barnabas and Boanerges; or Judgment and Mercy for Afflicted Soules* (1646); the two consisting of meditations, soliloquies, and prayers were published together (1667). He wrote also a number of royalist pamphlets, such as *The Loyall Convert* (1644), published with two others as *The Profest Royalist* (1645). The *Complete Works*, including his poetic romance, *Argulus and Parthenia*, and many posthumous publications was issued by A. B. Grosart (3 vols., 1880–81). The ruling theme of Quarles was the wretchedness of man's earthly existence. Though his leading works were immensely popular in their time, yet they obtained but few admirers among persons of literary distinction. James Montgomery (1827) and later writers have done him partial justice and he is now more favorably known; but even they charge him with "base phraseology, labored faults, and deforming conceits." His quips and quaintnesses belong to his age and there is no volume of his verse that is not illumined by occasional flashes of poetic fire. H. D. Thoreau writes of him: "He uses language sometimes as greatly as Shakespeare."

2. John Quarles, son of the above, was born in Essex in 1624; d. of the plague in London in 1665. He matriculated at Exeter College, Oxford, 1643; bore arms for the king at Oxford and was banished. Taking refuge in Flanders he wrote *Fons Lachrymarum* (London, 1648). Subsequently in London he published many poems, to one of which, *Divine Meditations* (1655), was appended *Several Divine Ejaculations* from which Thomas Darling adapted two hymns for his *Hymns for the Church of England* (1857), namely, "O King of kings, before whose throne," and "O thou who sitt'st in heaven and seest."

Bibliography: The original source is the *Short Relation of his Life and Death*, in the ed. of *Solomon's Recantation*, by Ursula, widow of Francis, London, 1645. The introduction to Grosart's ed. of the *Works* (ut sup.) is to be consulted, also *DNB*, xlvii. 92–97, the latter reference covering both Francis and John.

QUARTODECIMANS. See Easter, I., 3, II., § 1.

QUASIMODO GENITI. See Sunday.

QUEEN ANNE'S BOUNTY: A corporation for the purpose of improving small livings in the Church of England, initiated by Queen Anne in 1704. The original source of revenue so applied was the first-fruits and tithes of all benefices usurped by King John, made the property of the crown under Henry VIII., and yielded up for this purpose by Anne. She was enabled by acts of parliament to found the corporation and to make rules for its guidance by royal charter or letters patent. It also receives benefactions and administers them, and its activities have been enlarged so as to include repairs and the insuring of parsonages, as well as provision for erecting new buildings by long-term loans. Its capital is now nearly $25,000,000, with a yearly income of over $800,000, while its total benefactions exceed $30,000,000.

Bibliography: The one good account is by C. Hodgson, *An Account of the Augmentation of Small Livings by "The Governors of the Bounty of Queen Anne,"* with two supplements, London, 1826–65. A short summary is in W. F. Hook, *Church Dictionary*, pp. 634–635, London, 1887; cf. W. F. Hutton, *The English Church (1625–1714)*, pp. 256–257, London, 1903.

QUENSTEDT, cven'stet, **JOHANNES ANDREAS:** Lutheran dogmatician; b. at Quedlinburg (31 m. s.w. of Magdeburg) Aug. 13, 1617; d. at Wittenberg May 22, 1688. He was educated at the University of Helmstädt, 1637–43; and of Wittenberg, 1644, where he also lectured on geography; was adjunct professor in the philosophical faculty, 1646–49; ordinary professor of logic and metaphysics and associate professor of theology, 1649–60; and ordinary professor of theology, 1660–88. Quenstedt represents the old orthodox reaction after the period of reconstruction had set in; the fruit of his thirty years of work in the university lectureship was published in the *Theologia didactico-polemica sive systema theologicum* (Wittenberg, 1685; Leipsic, 1715), a work according to the strictest standard of Lutheran orthodoxy based upon the *Theologia positiva acroamatica* of J. F. König, and characterized by external dogmatization instead of a development of the subject from within, and abounding in artful scholastic refinements. He was noted among his contemporaries for his mild, irenic spirit and retiring, pious disposition, which is also shown by his *Ethica pastorum et instructio cathedralis* (1678), in which he advises to temper severity with gentleness in resisting heretics, and to distinguish between the tempters and the tempted; warns against pedantry in the pulpit; and recommends the reading of Johann Arndt's *Vom vahren Christenthum.* Other works are the *Dialogus de patriis illustrium doctrina et scriptis virorum* (Wittenberg, 1654), and a collection of dissertations, *Exercitationes de theologia in genere ejusque principio sancta scriptura* (1677).

(Johannes Kunze.)

Bibliography: A. Sennert, in H. Pipping, *Memoria theologorum*, pp. 229 sqq., Leipsic, 1705; J. F. Niceron, *Nachrichten von berühmten Gelehrten*, xx. 130 sqq., Halle, 1760; J. C. Erdmann, *Biographie sämtlicher Propste zu Wittenberg*, pp. 25–26, Wittenberg, 1802; idem, *Lebensbeschreibungen von den wittenbergischen Theologen*, pp. 87–88, ib. 1804; A. Tholuck, *Der Geist der lutherischen Theologen Wittenbergs*, pp. 214 sqq., Gotha, 1852; W. Gass, *Geschichte der protestantischen Dogmatik*, i. 357 sqq., Berlin, 1854; G. Frank, *Geschichte der protestantischen Theologie*, ii. 30, 4 vols., Leipsic, 1862–1905.

QUERCUM SYNODUS AD. See Chrysostom, § 4.

QUESNEL, kē″nel′, **PASQUIER:** Jansenistic author; b. at Paris July 14, 1634; d. at Amsterdam Dec. 2, 1719. He was educated at the Sorbonne, where he completed his theological studies (M.A., 1653). In 1657 he entered the Congregation of the Fathers of the Oratorium, then involved in the Jansenistic controversies; and in 1659 became priest. Before the age of twenty-eight he became director of the Paris Institute, the seminary of his order, where he was distinguished as a brilliant instructor, of keen understanding and immovable stability, as well as an amiable and modest character. He devoted himself early to the study of the Scriptures, and from this originated his main work, which drew upon him the enmity of the Jesuits, *Réflexions morales sur le Nouveau Testament* (*Le Nouveau Testament en François avec des réflexions morales sur chaque verset*, 4 vols., Paris, 1692; Eng. transl., *The New Testament, with Moral Reflections upon Every Verse*, by R. Russel, 4 vols., London, 1719–25). Originally only a brief treatment of a few passages of the Gospels, entitled *Abrégé de la morale de l'Évangile*, intended for practical use among his order, it gained such acceptance that Quesnel enlarged it to cover the four Gospels. Each new and enlarged edition met with an increased favor and the bishop of Châlons-sur-Marne, Felix Vialard, in a pastoral letter in 1671, commended it to his spiritual charge. When he published *Sancti Leonis papæ opera* (1675; folio, 1700), in which he defended the liberties of the Gallican Church (see GALLICANISM) and failed to dedicate the same to the archbishop of Paris, he gained the latter's ill-will, and was by him forced to leave Paris, whereupon he took up his residence at Orléans. Soon he felt constrained to retire from the Oratorium; and, unable to subscribe the Anti-Jansenistic formulas, he fled to Brussels in 1685, where Anton Arnauld (q.v.) was living, with whom he remained till the latter's death. Here he further extended the *Réflexions* to cover the entire New Testament, the work appearing complete for the first time in 1687, a new edition (of 1693) being endorsed by the bishop of Châlons, afterward archbishop of Paris and later Cardinal Louis Antoine de Noailles (q.v.). The work represented the Jansenistic doctrine, both dogmatic and practical; and when Quesnel had succeeded Arnauld at his death (1694) as head of the party and the strife was renewed in 1703, an order of arrest was secured from Philip V. of Spain, and Quesnel was imprisoned in the ward of the archbishop's palace. With the aid of friends he made his escape and lived in Holland the rest of his life. The seizure of all his papers and correspondence proved a disastrous weapon in the hands of the Jesuits against the Jansenists. The former secured a decree in 1708 from Pope Clement XI., condemning the *Réflexions*, but this was inhibited in France by reason of objections of a formal nature, and Quesnel's work obtained only the greater circulation. In the formally correct bull, *Unigenitus*, of 1713, 101 theses were condemned in the most violent pronouncements. The Cardinal de Noailles and seven other prelates rejected the bull, supported by most of the clericals of the orders and by the people, ever ready to take sides against the Jesuits. The main point at issue was the freedom of the Gallican Church. Quesnel meantime vindicated himself by various writings; and quiet and resigned, meek and pious, continued his authorship in exile, in a clear, forceful, elegant, and precise style. Other principal works were, *Tradition de l'église romaine sur la prédestination et la grâce* (4 vols., 1687); *La Discipline de l'église, tirée du Nouveau Testament et de quelques anciens conciles* (2 vols., Lyons, 1689); *Histoire abrégée de la vie et des ouvrages de M Arnauld*, appearing originally in 1695 as *Question curieuse* (Liége, 1699); *La Foi et l'innocence du clergé de Hollande défendues* (1700); and *L'Idée du sacerdoce et du sacrifice de Jésus Christ* (very many reprints). Some of his works of edification were, *Instructions chrétiennes et élévations à Dieu sur la passion* (Paris, 1702); *Jésus Christ pénitent, ou exercise de piété pour le temps du carême* (1728); *Elévation à Jésus Christ Notre Seigneur sur sa passion et sa mort* (reprinted many times); *Le Jour évangélique ou trois cent soixante vérités tirées du Nouveau Testament* (1700); *Le Bonheur de la mort chrétienne* (new ed., 1738), and *L'Office de Jésus, avec des réflexions.* P. F. Le Courayer has published a collection of correspondence, *Recueil de lettres spirituelles sur divers sujets de morale et de piété* (3 vols., Paris, 1721–23). His letters were edited by Madame Le Roy (2 vols., Paris, 1900).

(C. PFENDER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A. Schell, *Die Constitution Unigenitus*, pp. 27 sqq., Freiburg, 1876; G. H. Putnam, *The Censorship of the Church of Rome*, i. 357–361, ii. 410, New York, 1906–1907; Reusch, *Index*, ii. 661 sqq.; *Princeton Review*, 1856, pp. 132 sqq.; Lichtenberger, *ESR*, xi. 62–65; *KL*, x. 678–679.

QUIETISM. See MOLINOS, MIGUEL DE; GUYON, JEANNE MARIE BOUVIER DE LA MOTTE.

QUIGLEY, cwig′li, **JAMES EDWARD:** Roman Catholic; b. at Oshawa, Ontario, Oct. 15, 1854. He received his education at St. Joseph's College, Buffalo, N. Y., the Seminary of our Lady of Angels (now Niagara University), the University of Innsbruck, and the College of the Propaganda, Rome; was ordained priest, 1879; was pastor of St. Vincent's, Attica, N. Y., 1879–84; of St. Joseph's Cathedral, Buffalo, 1884–96; and of St. Bridget's Church, same city, 1896–97; became bishop of Buffalo, 1897–1903; and in 1903 was installed archbishop of Chicago.

QUINISEXT COUNCIL. See TRULLAN SYNOD.

QUINQUAGESIMA. See LENT; SUNDAY.

QUIRINIUS (QUIRINUS), cwai-rin′i-us, **PUBLIUS SULPICIUS:** A Roman general and administrator; b. at Lanuvium (c. 20 m. s. of Rome); d. in Rome 21 A.D. As a reward for military and administrative services he was raised by Augustus to the office of consul in the year 12 B.C. Later he waged successful war against the Homonadenses in Cilicia, and was granted the honor of a triumph. He was assigned as adviser to Caius Cæsar when this youth, a nephew and adopted son of the emperor, was engaged in the reduction of Armenia to order. He secretly paid court to Tiberius, who at the time was but a prince living in retirement on the island

His Life.

of Rhodes. From 6–9 A.D. he was *legatus Augusti*, i.e., governor, in Syria. At his death the Emperor Tiberius wrote to the senate asking that a public funeral be decreed. In this letter the emperor recalled the attentions paid to him by Quirinius at Rhodes and praised him for his good offices, apparently in preventing at that time misunderstandings between Tiberius and Caius Cæsar. But to the people generally the memory of Quirinius was by no means dear, because of his persistence in the trial of his wife Lepida, whose conviction he secured on the charges of adultery, attempted poisoning, and treasonable dealing, but who had the sympathy of the people; and also because of his sordid avarice even in his old age (Tacitus, *Annales*, iii. 48; Strabo, xii. 6, 3, and 5; Josephus, *Ant.*, XVII., xiii. 5, XVIII., i. 1, ii. 1). As a necessary conclusion from the facts recited by Tacitus, and in view of Roman governmental principles, it is inferred that Quirinius was governor of Syria, not only 6–9 A.D., but also at the time of the war in Cilicia, probably during 3–2 B.C., in succession to Varus (Zumpt, Mommsen, Schürer). Ramsay dates this earlier Syrian administration—not a governership, however—and the conquest of the Homonadenses in 4–3 B.C. at the latest, but perhaps earlier; and Quirinius' proconsulship of the province Asia (attested, he believes, by the Tivoli inscription) at latest 3–2 B.C.

In the book of the Acts Luke mentions an enrolment of the people which was made in Judea and provoked bitter opposition (Acts v. 37). This was the census which, according to Josephus, was taken when Quirinius was governor of Syria and Coponius was procurator, i.e., between 6–9 A.D. (*Ant.*, XVIII., i. 1, ii. 1; *War.*, II., viii. 1). In the Gospel also Luke mentions an enrolment in Palestine (see CENSUS). It was part of a general enumeration decreed by Augustus for the entire Roman empire. It led to the visit of Joseph and Mary to Bethlehem, and was thus in a way the occasion of the birth of Christ in that town. Luke calls this "the first enrolment made when Quirinius was governor of Syria" (Luke ii. 2). Now the birth of Christ took place before the death of Herod the Great (Matt. ii. 1; Luke iii. 1, 2, 23). Herod died in the year 4 B.C. How then can Luke say that Quirinius was governor of Syria? C. Sentius Saturninus held that office from 9 or 8 to the first half of the year 6 B.C.; and was succeeded by P. Quinctilius Varus, who continued until 4 B.C.

Luke's References.

Here, then, is a matter for investigation, and, if possible, elucidation. No evidence has been adduced against the genuineness of the verse in Luke, or of the reading "Quirinius" in that passage. Nor does any suspicion of error attach to the statements of Josephus which fix the date of the administrations of Saturninus and Varus and of Quirinius, a decade later, when Judas of Galilee revolted. As to Luke's statement that the enrolment, which was being conducted at the time of Christ's birth, took place "when Quirinius was governor of Syria," Mommsen and Schürer, for example, have expressed the opinion that the evangelist erred. But this summary dismissal of Luke's testimony as erroneous has not been deemed wholly satisfactory by scholars, for Luke shows himself well informed on historical matters and his accuracy has been vindicated in many other instances. Moved by considerations of this kind Zumpt, in the middle of the last century, having found reason to believe that Quirinius held the office of legate of Syria in 3–2 B.C. in succession to Varus, gave it as his opinion that the first enrolment began indeed during the administration of Saturninus, but was completed during the first governorship of Quirinius, 3–2 B.C. In principle this is the theory of Ramsay also. His modification consists in that he does not regard Quirinius as sole legate for Syria and successor to Varus (as do Zumpt, Mommsen, and Schürer); but as a legate for a special purpose, who was associated with the legate appointed for the general administration. And Ramsay elaborates the theory of Zumpt in that he offers an explanation for the delay in completing the census, his explanation being the same as that given long ago by Hales. It is known that under the Roman government a periodic enumeration of households was conducted in Egypt every fourteen years, reckoned from 23 B.C., the imperial year of Augustus. Professor Ramsay finds evidence of an enrolment in Syria, too, according to the fourteen-year cycle; Tertullian referring to one during the governorship of Saturninus, Josephus to one in 6 A.D., and Tacitus to one in 34 A.D. Thus an enrolment was due in Syria in the year 8 B.C. and made; but in Herod's kingdom it was probably delayed for some time, for Herod had gotten himself into trouble with Augustus. With the consent of Saturninus, governor of Syria, Herod had marched an army into Arabia to redress certain wrongs which he had received (*Ant.*, XVI., ix. 2). This proceeding was misrepresented to the emperor, who notified Herod, probably in the year 8 B.C., that henceforth he would treat him as a subject. Some time afterward the whole nation of the Jews, except 6,000 Pharisees, took an oath of fidelity to Cæsar and the king jointly (*Ant.*, XVII., ii. 4). Obviously the two acts, the oath and the enrolment, form part of the new policy of Augustus toward Herod. The date of the enrolment and the oath may be the year 6 B.C.; for Herod would have had little difficulty in obtaining leave from Saturninus to postpone the numbering until the embassy, which, after Augustus announced the change of policy toward him, he was sending to Rome to seek a reconciliation with the emperor and a restoration of the old order, should return and report the result of its efforts. Herod was finally obliged to order the census, and it was probably taken in the summer of the year 6 B.C., when Quirinius was a special *legatus Augusti* to Syria, invested with the command of the army and entrusted with its foreign affairs, such as the relations between its several states and Rome, particularly where tension existed and military intervention might be necessary. Quirinius stood in exactly the same relation to Varus, the governor of Syria, as at a later time Vespasian did to Mucianus. Vespasian conducted the war in Palestine while Mucianus was governor of Syria; and Vespasian was *legatus Augusti*, holding precisely

The "First Enrolment."

the same title and technical rank as Mucianus. See CENSUS, II., §§ 4–5. JOHN D. DAVIS.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A. W. Zumpt, *Commentationum epigraphicarum ad antiquitates Romanas pertinentium*, vol. ii., Berlin, 1854; idem, *Das Geburtsjahr Christi*, Leipsic, 1869; T. Mommsen, *Res gestæ divi Augusti*, Berlin, 1865; Bour, *L'Inscription de Quirinius et le recensement de St. Luc*, Rome, 1897; W. M. Ramsay, *Was Christ Born at Bethlehem?* London and New York, 1898; Schürer, *Geschichte*, i. 322–324, 510–543, Eng. transl., I., i. 351–354, et passim (consult Index); Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire*, vol. ii., col 1186; *DB*, iv. 183; *EB*, iv. 3994–96; *DCG*, ii. 463–464. An extensive bibliography of the subject is in Schürer, Germ. ed., i. 508–509; good references are also given in Thayer's *Greek-English Lexicon*, p. 365, New York, 1889. For the Tivoli and Venice inscriptions, consult T. Mommsen in *Ephemeris Epigraphica*, iv. 538; Ramsay, ut sup., pp. 273–274; Schürer, *Geschichte*, i. 324–325, Eng. transl., I., i. 355.

QUIRK, cwŭrk, JOHN NATHANIEL: Church of England bishop; b. at Ashton-under-Lyne (6 m. e. of Manchester) Dec. 14, 1849. He received his education at St. John's College, Cambridge (B.A., 1873; M.A., 1876; D.D., 1902); was made deacon in 1874, and priest, 1875; was curate of St. Leonard, Bridgnorth, 1874–78, and of Doncaster, 1878–1881; vicar of St. Thomas, Douglas, Isle of Man, 1881–82; and of Rotherham, 1882–89, being also chaplain of Rotherham Union, 1883–89, and lecturer of Rotherham, 1884–89; vicar of Beverley, 1889–94; and of St. Paul, Newington, 1894–95; rector of Bath, 1895–1901, serving also as rural dean of Bath, 1895–1901, chaplain of Bath United Hospitals, 1898–1901 and proctor of the diocese of Bath and Wells, 1900–01; was consecrated bishop suffragan of Sheffield, 1901; vicar of Doncaster, 1901–05; chaplain to the corporation of Doncaster, 1901–05; and vicar of St. Mark, Broomhall, Sheffield, 1905. He was also canon and prebendary of Apesthorpe in York cathedral, 1888, and proctor in convocation, 1898–1901.

R

RAAMAH. See TABLE OF THE NATIONS, § 6.

RAAMSES. See MOSES, § 4.

RABANUS, rā-bā'nus (HRABANUS, RHABANUS), MAURUS: One of the most important churchmen of the Carolingian period; b. at Mainz between 776 and 784; d. at Winkel (on the Rhine, 10 m. w. of Mainz) Feb. 4, 856. He writes his name Magnentius Hrabanus Maurus, Magnentius probably referring to his Mainz origin; Hrabanus is connected with Old High German *hraban*, "raven," and the surname Maurus was given him by Alcuin. He was educated in the abbey of Fulda, where he entered the Benedictine order, and was ordained deacon in 801. Then he was sent to Tours to study not only theology, but the liberal arts with Alcuin, and, returning to Fulda, taught in the school, which flourished under his care. He was ordained priest in 814, and became abbot of Fulda in 822, showing marked capacity for the manifold duties imposed upon him as the head of a great monastery. He completed the rebuilding of the abbey, begun under his predecessor, and erected a number of churches and oratories in the surrounding country, besides caring for the development of various artistic talents among the monks, and turning them to good account in the decoration of his churches. He increased the property and the immunities of the abbey, and defended them from attacks; but his principal attention was given to his spiritual duties. As abbot he found time to give instruction in the Scriptures, and preached zealously to the people round about, stirring up the neighboring clergy to a like zeal. After twenty years of rule, he resigned the abbacy in the spring of 842, and retired to a church which he had built on the Petersberg, not far away, where he divided his time between devotional exercises and literary activity. He was drawn from his retirement in 847 by the call to succeed Otgar as archbishop of Mainz, and held his first provincial synod in October. Others followed in 848 and 852. Besides showing the same zeal for the welfare of souls that he had exhibited at Fulda, he impressed his contemporaries by his acts of charity, feeding more than 300 people daily in the famine of 850. He still managed to continue writing, and took part in the controversy aroused by the eucharistic teaching of Paschasius Radbertus (q.v.). He was acknowledged as the leading authority on Holy Scripture, later ecclesiastical literature, and canon law in the whole Frankish empire. His greatest services were to the cause of education; it was he who first made literary and theological culture at home east of the Rhine. His life was blameless, and eminent in the purity of his ideals.

Life.

His writings fall into various classes. Among those of an exegetical nature, the earliest is his commentary on Matthew, composed between 814 and 822. It is less an original work than a compilation, especially from Jerome, Augustine, and Gregory the Great. During the period of his abbacy, at the request of Freculf, bishop of Lisieux, he dealt with the Pentateuch in a similar manner, though here the allegorical method of interpretation came into greater prominence. Commentaries followed on the other historical books of the Old Testament, with the exception of Ezra and Nehemiah, and including Maccabees. Then he explained Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel. To a later period probably belong the commentaries on Proverbs, the Pauline epistles, and the Gospel of John. Of these there are yet unpublished Isaiah (a twelfth-century manuscript in the possession of Erlangen University), Daniel and John (Munich Library).

His Commentaries.

For the two collections of his homilies, one dedicated to Haistulf (before 826) and one to the Emperor Lothair, see HOMILIARIUM. In the same connection should be mentioned the treatise *De videndo Deo* (after 842). The *De modo pœnitentiæ* sometimes included with this as a third book is an independent work, warmly exhorting the reader

to true repentance. While still only a monk, he composed his *De clericorum institutione* dedicated to Archbishop Haistulf, written to instruct the clergy on the significance of their office and things connected with it. The first book treats of the Church, holy orders, clerical vestments, the mass, and the sacraments; the second of liturgics; and the third of the theological and general education of the clergy. Though an original work in substance, it yet owes a good deal (as Rabanus himself says) to older treatises, especially the *Institutiones* of Cassiodorus and the *De doctrina Christiana* of Augustine. To the same period belong a grammatical work after Priscian and a chronological *Liber de computo* (820). While abbot of Fulda, he seems to have put together his Martyrology, and after he had retired to the Petersberg to have employed his leisure in writing the twenty-two books *De universo*, a sort of encyclopedic compendium of knowledge. To the same interval of quiet belongs the *De ecclesiastica disciplina*, partly based on Augustine and partly a recasting of the *De clericorum institutione;* only the last book, entitled *De agone Christiano*, a compendium of ethical teaching, is independent. During his episcopate he expanded the first book of the *De clericorum institutione* into a more extended treatise *De sacris ordinibus, sacramentis divinis et vestmentis sacerdotalibus*, and wrote a treatise *De anima*, dedicated to the Emperor Lothair. Of uncertain date is the *Allegoriæ*, a collection of terms used allegorically in Scripture, with explanations and examples. A few writings on ecclesiastical discipline remain to be mentioned—the *Pœnitentium liber*, dedicated to Otgar of Mainz; a *Pœnitentiale* composed during his episcopate at the request of Heribald of Auxerre; a letter, and a treatise addressed to Hatto of Fulda, on degrees of consanguinity; another *De magicis artibus;* and a letter to the chorepiscopus Reginbald on various disciplinary questions.

Ecclesiastical Works.

Controversies of the time gave rise to the *De oblatione puerorum*, an affirmation of the perpetuity of monastic principles under all conditions occasioned by the decision of the Council of Mainz to release Gottschalk (q.v.) from his vows, and a number of letters dealing with the whole controversy associated with his name; a memorial to Drogo of Metz on the position of *Chorepiscopi* (q.v.); a defense of Louis the Pious against his sons and the bishops after the events of 833, and the somewhat later *De vitiis et virtutibus*. In verse he showed himself, though not a great poet, a competent artist; to this division belong his earliest work, *In laudem sanctæ crucis*, and a number of epitaphs and other inscriptions. (A. Hauck.)

Bibliography: The *Opera*, ed. J. Pamelius, A. de Henin, and G. Colvenerius, were issued in 6 vols., Cologne, 1626–1627, reprinted, with prolegomena and a collection of lives, in *MPL*, cvii.–cxii. The poems, with prolegomena, are in *MGH, Poet. Lat. ævi Carol.*, ii (1884), 154–244; and the *Epistolæ* are in *MGH, Epist.*, v (1898), 379 sqq., 517 sqq. Sources for a life are the *Miracula sanctorum* of Rudolphus, ed. G. Waitz in *MGH, Script.*, xv (1887), 328 sqq., and with commentary in *ASB*, Feb., i. 500–522; J. F. Böhmer, *Regesta archiepiscoporum Moguntinensium*, ed. C. Will, pp. xiv.–xxiv., 64 sqq., Innsbruck, 1877; and the material gathered in *MPL*, cvii. Consult further: J. K. Dahl, *Leben und Schriften des Erzbischofs Rabonus Maurus*, Fulda, 1828; N. Bach, *Hrabanus Maurus, der Schöfper des deutschen Schulwesens*, Fulda, 1835; F. Kunstmann, *Hrabanus Magnentius Mourus*, Mainz, 1841; H. Colombel, *Vita Hraboni Mauri*, Weilburg, 1856; T. Spengler, *Leben des heiligen Rhabanus Maurus*, Regensburg, 1856; C. Schwartz, *Zur Feier der 1000-jährigen Erinnerung an Rabanus Maurus*, Fulda, 1858; E. Dümmler, in *NA*, iv. 286–294; idem, *Geschichte des ostfränkischen Reichs*, i. 299–303, 383–390, Berlin, 1862; idem, in *ADB*, xxvii. 66–74; E. Köhler, *Hrabanus Maurus und die Schule zu Fulda*, Leipsic, 1869; J. C. F. Bähr, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur im karolingischen Zeitalter*, pp. 415–447, Carlsruhe, 1870; J. B. Mullinger, *The Schools of Charles the Great*, pp. 138–157, London, 1877; A. Ebert, *Allgemeine Geschichte der Literatur des Mittelalters*, ii. 120–145, Leipsic, 1880; A. West, *Alcuin and the Rise of the Christian Schools*, New York, 1893; H. Rashdall, *Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, New York, 1895; Hauck, *KD*, ii. 620 sqq.; Mann, *Popes*, pp. 146–147, 256, 316; Schaff, *Christian Church*, iv. 424 sqq., 522, 525 sqq., 614–615, 713–728; Neander, *Christian Church*, iii. 457 sqq.; *KL*, x. 697 sqq.

RABAUT (ST. ÉTIENNE), rê'bō, JEAN PAUL: French Protestant, oldest son of Paul Rabaut; b. at Nîmes Nov. 14, 1743; d. at Paris Dec. 5, 1794. As a student he gave evidence of great oratorical ability. He was ordained to the ministry in 1764; the next year he became his father's colleague, and a "preacher in the Desert." In 1768 he married, and was subsequently diverted from his career as a preacher into the current of political affairs. He went to Paris in 1785 to labor for the liberation from prison of his coreligionists, where he gained the ear of such influential men as Rulhières, Malesherbes, and Lafayette. He was appointed deputy from his native town to the National Assembly, and in the memorable session of 1789 his arguments produced such profound impression that the motion of Count Castellane was carried: "No man should be disturbed because of his opinions or harassed in the exercise of his religion." On Mar. 14, 1790, he was, in spite of the decided opposition of the Roman Catholic party, elected president of the National Assembly. During his sojourn in Paris he devoted himself to literary pursuits, and on Sept. 2, 1792, he was again elected to the National Convention. In the trial by that assembly of Louis XVI. he cast his vote against the latter, urging clemency, while throughout the proceedings he strongly contended against the jurisdiction of the convention in its case against the king. He was promptly proscribed by the authorities, but managed to keep in hiding until Dec. 4 of that year, when, owing to an indiscretion, he was arrested, and on the following day beheaded under Robespierre's régime. His collected works appeared in six volumes, edited by his friend, Boissy d'Anglas (Paris, 1820–26); the most noteworthy being: *Le Vieux Cévenol, ou anecdotes de la vie d'Ambroise Borelly* (1779), appearing under different titles 1788, 1820, 1826, etc., where, interwoven with a family biography, may be found a thrilling account of the persecutions and hardships to which the followers of Protestantism were subjected by the Roman Catholic party and the French government; *Lettre sur la vie de Court de Gébelin* (1784); *Lettres à M. Bailly sur l'histoire primitive de la Grêce* (1787); while the best account, from a historical standpoint, of the French Revolution may be found in

Almanach historique de la révolution française, 1791, transl., with additions, into Eng., German, and Dutch, together with *Précis historique de la révolution française*, containing a clear and concise treatment of all important events to 1792.

(EUGEN LACHENMANN.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A sketch of the life prefaces the collected works, ut sup. Consult further: Collin de Prancy, *Œuvres de Rabaut St. Etienne*, 2 vols., Paris, 1826; L. Bresson, *Rabaut St. Etienne, sa vie et ses œuvres*, Strasburg, 1865; C. Dardier, in *Revue chrétienne*, Feb., 1886; A. Lods, *Essai sur la vie de Rabaut St. Etienne*, Paris, 1893; *Tercentenary Celebration of the Promulgation of the Edict of Nantes*, pp. 169, 338, New York, 1900; and the literature under RABAUT, PAUL, especially the work of A. Borrel.

RABAUT, PAUL: French Protestant reformer; b. at Bédarieux (20 m. n. of Béziers) Jan. 29, 1718; d. at Nîmes Sept. 25, 1794. He was the leader, associated with Antoine Court (q.v.), in the restoration of the Reformed Protestant Church of France. Coming of a pronounced Protestant family, he joined himself at the age of sixteen to the itinerant preacher Jean Bétrine, sharing with him all the dangers and vicissitudes to which the followers of his faith were subjected by the French government in the eighteenth century (1734–38). During this period he received thorough training not only in the fundamental principles of theology and pastoral activity, but also as a fearless witness of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and was, on Apr. 30, 1738, proclaimed preacher by the Synod of Lower Languedoc, Nîmes and its vicinity becoming his field of labor. In 1739 he married Madeleine Gaidan of that city, who for forty-eight years shared with him the trials and tribulations of his career as "preacher of the Desert," bearing him eight children, of whom, however, only three sons survived. In 1740 he entered the theological seminary at Lausanne, founded by Court, to finish his studies in theology, his wife remaining at Nîmes. After a stay of but six months he returned and began his career which he zealously pursued in the face of the most cruel persecution, illustrated by the case of Jean Calas. This man was a respectable Protestant merchant of Toulouse, whose son, Marc-Antoine, in a fit of melancholy, hanged himself in his father's house. The Catholics spread the rumor that the son was about to embrace Roman Catholicism when the father slew him. The latter was seized, tried, and condemned to death on the wheel, and his body was burned, Mar. 9, 1672. The family property was confiscated, and the family in part fled to Geneva. The case was taken up by Voltaire and others, a reversal was secured, the family property was restored, and a pension granted the widow. This case is exceptional only in the fact that finally justice was done. Rabaut was small of stature, his personal appearance being in no way equal to the nobility and steadfastness of his soul and mind; but what he lacked in personality was compensated for by fidelity to his cause, bravery in the face of danger, and long-suffering in deprivation and affliction. The powerful influence which he exerted for well-nigh half a century on the history of the Reformed Protestant Church of France is largely accounted for by his undying devotion to his church and its followers, his unselfishness in the cause of others, his soundness of mind and doctrine, his coolness in danger, and his love for all humanity. For, though never officially appointed as the head of the Reformed Protestant Church of France, he earned the distinction of being the recognized leader in all matters of importance. He was vice-president of the General Synod of Aug. 18–21, 1744, and president of the National Synod of 1756. He seems to have led a charmed life, for, though hunted like a beast of prey and cornered again and again, he always managed to elude his would-be captors. While both he and his family suffered great hardships, he had the good fortune to see the triumph of the cause for which he had suffered so much and had given his all. On June 10, 1763, he led as moderator the disputations of the national synod. From that time until Oct. 6, 1785, he set himself the arduous task of reconstruction and rehabilitation of his beloved church, in which task he was ably assisted by his oldest son. On the above date the consistory of Nîmes fully reinstated him, restoring to him his title, together with full freedom of worship and the privileges and salary of a clergyman. Even his last years, however, were not untroubled, for, in 1794, about six months prior to his death, he was arrested and confined for several months in the citadel at Nîmes, obtaining his liberty after the overthrow of Robespierre, July 27. However, the recent loss of his wife and his oldest son, together with his bodily feebleness, hastened his end. He died in the house in which for a considerable time prior to his end he had lived, and was buried, as was customary (there being as yet no cemeteries for Protestants), in the cellar thereof. It is said that the house still stands and is used as an orphanage. In the field of literature he did not leave a great deal, nor could more have been expected of him under such adverse circumstances. Besides a number of pamphlets, he wrote: *Précis du catéchisme d'Ostervald*, often reprinted; also two sermons: *La Livrée de l'église Chrétienne*, on Cant. iv. 4, and *La Soif spirituelle*, on John vii. 37.

(EUGEN LACHENMANN.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The correspondence of Paul Rabaut, ed. A. Picheral-Dardier and C. Dardier, appeared in 4 vols., Paris, 1885–91. A brief life is prefixed to vol. i., 1885. Consult: J. P. de N., *Notice biographique sur Paul Rabaut*, Paris, 1808; M. Juillerat, *Notice biographique sur Paul Rabaut*, Paris, 1826; A. Coquerel, *Hist. des églises du désert*, 2 vols., Paris, 1841; L. G. Michaud, *Biographie universelle*, sub voce, 45 vols., Paris, 1843–65; A. Borrel, *Biographie de Paul Rabaut . . . et ses trois fils*, Nîmes, 1854; L. Bridel, *Trois séances sur Paul Rabaut*, Lausanne, 1859; É. and E. Haag, *La France protestante*, sub voce, 2d ed., Paris, 1877 sqq.; E. Hugues, *Les Synodes du désert*, 3 vols., Paris, 1885–86; idem, *A. Court, Hist. de la restauration du protestantisme*, 2 vols., Paris, 1872; T. Schott, in *Deutsch-evangelische Blätter*, Dec., 1893; idem, *Die Kirche der Wüste, 1715–87*, Halle, 1893; Lichtenberger, *ESR*, xi. 73–84 (covers the family).

RABAUT, PIERRE: French Protestant, youngest son of Paul Rabaut, known also as Dupuis and Rabaut le jeune; b. at Nîmes in Apr., 1746; d. there 1808. He chose a commercial career, but, like his two brothers, took an active part in politics, being elected to parliament and later to the bench in his native city. Of his works the following deserve mention for their value to French Protestantism of the eighteenth century: *Details historiques et re-*

cueil de pièces sur les divers projets qui ont été concus, depuis la Réformation jusqu'à ce jour, pour la réunion de toutes les communions chrétiennes (Paris, 1806); *Notice historique sur la situation des églises chrétiennes réformées en France depuis leur rétablissement jusqu'à ce jour* (1806); and *Annuaire ou répertoire ecclésiastique à l'usage des églises réformées et protestantes* (1807). (EUGEN LACHENMANN.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The works by Haag and Borrel given under RABAUT, PAUL.

RABAUT-POMMIER, JACQUES-ANTOINE: French Protestant, second son of Paul Rabaut (q.v.); b. at Nîmes Oct 24, 1744; d. at Paris Mar. 16, 1820. He was, together with his elder brother, educated at Geneva and Lausanne. In 1770 he was called to Marseilles as preacher, being the first of his faith to occupy a pulpit since the abrogation of the Edict of Nantes. In 1782 he went to Montpellier, where, with the assistance of some friends he was enabled to found a large hospital. During his stay in the southern part of France he was busy with scientific and medical studies, becoming the first advocate of vaccination as a preventive of smallpox. In 1790 he was elected to the magistracy of Montpellier, and in 1792 representative to the national convention. He was under Robespierre's rule arrested, but by some error overlooked, and after Robespierre's death was liberated. Napoleon created him vice-prefect of Vigan. On Dec. 3, 1802, the consistory of Paris called him (together with Marron and Jean Monod) to fill a pulpit in the latter city, where he labored with splendid results until Mar. 17, 1816, when he was exiled for the part played by him in the proceedings against Louis XVI. Two years later Count Boissy d'Anglas brought about his reinstatement, but, owing to infirmities due to the many vicissitudes of his active career, he died two years later. His only publications are *Napoléon libérateur, discours religieux* (Paris, 1810); and *Sermon d'actione de grâces sur le retour de Louis XVIII.* (1814).

(EUGEN LACHENMANN.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Consult the *Notice biographique* by Coquerel in *Nouvel annuaire protestant*, pp. 299–325, Paris, 1821; A. Lods, *Le Pasteur Rabaut Pommier, membre de la Convention Nationale, 1744–1820*, Paris, 1893; and the literature under RABAUT, PAUL, especially the work of A. Borrel.

RABBINIC BIBLES. See BIBLES, RABBINIC.

RABBINISM: A term applied to the scholastic Judaism which developed from the fourth pre-Christian century till the completion of the Talmud. See ISRAEL, HISTORY OF, II. 1, 2, §§ 3–4; MIDRASH; TALMUD.

RABBULA, ra'bu-la **(RABULAS):** Bishop of Edessa 411–435. He was born at Ginnesrin (Chalcis) in Syria of a heathen father and Christian mother, and was baptized in the Jordan. His name signifies "chief shepherd." He was the predecessor and opponent of Ibas, and a decided supporter of the Synod of Ephesus, 432. He was described as a bishop whom his flock both feared and loved, a second Josiah in his zeal for the Church, destroying the synagogue of the Bardesanites and the chapel of the Arians, conquering the Marcionites by patience and the Manicheans by wisdom, and procuring peace by removing Borborians, Audians, Sadducees, and Messalians, until the heresy of Nestorius again caused dissension. On the question whether the building which he changed into a chapel of St. Stephen was a synagogue of the Jews or a place of worship of the Audians cf. Hallier in *TU*, ix. 1 (1892), 106. His writings refer chiefly to matters of church discipline and rules for monks and clerics. Fragments of his correspondence with Andrew of Samosata, Gemellinus of Perrhi, and Cyril of Alexandria (q.v.) are extant. He translated the treatise of the last-named on the Incarnation (cf. Bedjan, *Acta martyrum*, v. 628–696, Paris, 1895; *MPG*, lxxvi. 1144, and Guidi, in *Rendiconti dei Lincei*, May-June, 1886, pp. 416, 546). There are known also some church hymns, which seem to be translated from the Greek, and a sermon preached at Constantinople on the question whether the Virgin may be called *theotokos*. It seems certain that the revision of the New Testament which is ascribed to him by his biographer, is the Peshito (cf. *Journal of Theological Studies*, vii. 2; *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica*, v. 231, 1903; and see BIBLE VERSIONS, A., III. Cf. also F. C. Burkitt, *Early Eastern Christianity*, London, 1904). Whether he is the person mentioned in the Syriac inscription "Rabbula made the throne; his memory be blessed" (Littmann, *Semitic Inscriptions*, 1905) is not easily decided.

E. NESTLE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The prose writings are in Germ. transl. by Bickell in Thalhofer's *Bibliothek der Kirchenväter*, x. 153–271, Kempten, 1875. Consult: J. S. Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, i. 198, Rome, 1719; Bar Hebræus, *Nomocanon*, in A. Mai, *Scriptorum veterum nova collectio*, vol. x., Rome, 1838 (contains numerous quotations); Tillemont, *Mémoires*, xiv. 504–506, 563–565; Ephraemi Syri, *Rabulæ episcopi Edesseni, Balæi, aliorumque opera selecta*, ed. J. J. Overbeck, pp. 152–248, 362–378, Oxford, 1865; G. Hoffmann, *Verhandlungen der Kirchenversammlung zu Ephesus*, 449, Kiel, 1873; F. Lagrange, in *Science catholique*, Sept., 1888; R. Duval, *La Littérature Syriaque*, pp. 341–343, Paris, 1900. The "life" is in P. Bedjan, *Acta martyrum et sanctorum*, iv. 398–460, Paris, 1894; cf. L. Köhler, in *Schweizerische theologische Zeitschrift*, xxv (1908), 210–224 (begins a series of studies in Syriac literature with a sketch of Rabbula); and especially the work of Burkitt named in the text; also O. Bardenhewer, *Patrologie*, pp. 323–324, 347–348, Freiburg, 1901. The sketch in *DCB*, iv. 532–534 is very full.

RABERGH, rā'bārh, **HERMAN:** Finnish bishop; b. in Abo (150 m. n.e. of Stockholm), Finland, Sept. 4, 1838. He received his education at Helsingfors (B.A., 1858; Candidate in Theology, 1867; Lic. and Th.D., 1872); in 1872 he was appointed privat-docent, and in 1873 professor, of church history there. Because of prolonged vacancies in the faculty of theology he was obliged to act as professor of practical theology (1876–82) and of dogmatics (1885–92), besides discharging the duties connected with his own chair. His earlier researches were in general ecclesiastical history, his later historical contributions were to Finnish church history. His personal influence with the students was very marked, while his activities were extensive as preacher and as member of various church societies; he was pastor (1870–75) and rector (1875–84) of the Deaconess' Home in Helsingfors; president of the Finnish Missionary Society (1886–90), and director of the Helsingfors City Mission (1883–93). In 1892 he was made bishop of Borga. As bishop he has

been the leader of that faction of the Finnish clergy which defended confessional-conservative views in matters concerning the polity and government of the Finnish national church. He was a member of the general church assembly of 1886, which adopted a new hymnal in Swedish and Finnish, three new series of pericopes, and recommended the preparation of a new ritual and of a new manual for Christian instruction. He was a delegate also to the assemblies of 1893, 1898, 1903, as well as member of several commissions on ecclesiastical legislation, and president of the commission which prepared the new ritual (1903).

Among his writings are: *Nikolaus af Basel i förhallande till kyrkan og mystikerna i det 14. Aarh.* (1870); *De reformator. ideernes utveckling intill 1548* (1880); *Den evang. predikoverksamhetens grundläggning och utveckling intill 1640* (1883); *Theologiens studium vid Åbo universitet I.-II.* (Helsingfors, 1893–1902). His ecclesiastical program was set forth in *Folkekyrkan och den separatistiska rörelsen* (1892); while his *Minnen och erfarenheter* (1907) is autobiographic. JOHN O. EVJEN.

RACOVIAN CATECHISM. See SOCINUS, FAUSTUS, SOCINIANISM.

RADBERTUS, rad-bār'tus, **PASCHASIUS:** Medieval abbot; b. at or near Soissons (56 m. n.e. of Paris) about 786; d. at Corbie (9 m. e. of Amiens) Apr. 26, about 865. He was one of the most distinguished writers of the Carolingian period. The little that is known of his life is derived from scattered notices in his own writings and from a panegyric on him by Bishop Engelmodus of Soissons (*MPL*, cxx. 25 sqq.; *MGH, Poet. Lat. ævi Car.*, iii. 1886, pp. 62 sqq.). Brought up by the Benedictine nuns of Soissons, he entered the monastery of Corbie in Picardy under the Abbot Adalhard (see ADALHARD AND WALA), and gained early distinction for his theological learning, piety, and moral enthusiasm; his range of familiarity with classical authors was remarkable for that period, also with the Fathers, and the leading authorities of the Eastern and Western churches; but he probably knew neither Greek nor Hebrew. Because of his wealth of learning he became the instructor of the young monks at Corbie and had a large number of distinguished pupils; but notwithstanding his eminence he never became a priest. He was abbot in 844–851, but retired on account of difficulties arising from efforts to reform the lax discipline. Of his writings are extant his expositions (1) of Matthew, in twelve books, the first four written before his retirement; (2) of Ps. xliv.; (3) of Lamentations, written in 845–857; (4) *De corpore et sanguine Domini*, 831–833; (5) *Epistola ad Frudegardum;* (6) *De partu virginis*, dedicated to the nuns of Soissons, by whom he was brought up; (7) *De fide, spe, et caritate libri tres;* (8) *De passione Sancti Rufini et Valerii;* (9) *De vita Sancti Adalhardi;* and (10) *Epitaphium Arsenii libri duo*, a biography of Abbot Wala. The first of the above biographies is a panegyric and the other an apology. In exegesis Radbertus was not original even in aim. His work on faith, hope, and love shows him to be a follower of St. Augustine, and it consists mostly of repetitions of the latter's sentences. His character as traditionalist appears still more pronounced in *De corpore*, the first comprehensive treatise on the Lord's Supper written in the Christian Church, and the cause of the first controversy over the Eucharist, establishing his reputation for orthodoxy securely in the eyes of the future.

Life and Works.

Radbertus combined the symbolic idea of Augustine with the transformation doctrine of others; but he was thoroughly convinced himself that Augustine believed that the true historic body of Christ was present in the Eucharistic elements. Such thoughts of Radbert as these exhibit Augustine's standpoint: Christ and his flesh constitute not a material but a spiritual and divine sustenance and serve only as objects of a purely spiritual partaking (v. 1–2). To eat the flesh of the Lord and drink his blood means nothing else than that the believer abides in Christ and Christ in him (vi.–vii.). Only faith enables to transcend the visible and to apprehend from within what the fleshly mouth does not touch or the fleshly eye does not see (viii. 2). Christ is food only for the elect, and only they are worthy to partake of him who are of his body (xxi. 5, vii. 1). The partaking of the flesh of Christ by the unworthy seemed to him impossible, hence he accepted Augustine's distinction between the sacrament or mystery and the virtue of the same. Under the term virtue he included not, as in his later works, only the vitalizing power of the flesh of Christ, but, in Augustinian mode of speech, what was offered in the symbols to faith, or the content of the sacrament, that is, the flesh of Christ itself with the fulness of his saving virtues. Accordingly, the unworthy receive not anything but bread and wine. The priest indeed distributes to all alike; the high priest, however, distinguishes between the worthy and unworthy; and the latter receive the sacrament or mystery only to judgment, the former receive the virtue. Spiritual sustenance in Christ effects the forgiveness of sins (iv. 3, xi. 1, xv. 3), union with Christ (iii. 4), and spiritual sustenance of the whole man to eternal life (xi. 2–3, xix. 1–2, xx. 2). So far the points are Augustinian; parallel with these he places a thought-series teaching a transubstantiation represented in the pseudo-Ambrosian writings. This teaching is carried by him to its full conclusion. What by faith is received in the sacrament is the body born of Mary that suffered on the cross and rose from the grave (i. 2). It is the body and blood, not the virtue of the body and blood (*Epist. ad Frudegardum*, p. 1357); the sacramental body must be regarded as the natural body of Christ (cf. *De corpore*, xiv. 4), which does not exclude it from being considered as in the state of glorification (vii. 2). In the consecration the sensible properties remain unchanged, but the substance of the bread and wine within are efficaciously changed into the real body and blood of Christ (viii. 2). This is done by miracle (i. 2), a creative act performed by the word of the Creator; more particularly, through the medium of Christ's words of institution since he is himself the substantial and eternal Word. The body of Christ is not perceptible by the senses, because that would be super-

Views on the Eucharist.

fluous (visibility of the presence of the body) and would not increase the reality, and to eat the flesh in its sensible appearance would clash with human custom (xi. 1); because such reception would seem repulsive and ridiculous to heathen and unbelievers (xiii. 1 sqq.); but mostly because the operation would no longer be a mystery but a pure miracle, whereas the former by concealing the content does not originate but excites faith so that this is preserved and its meritorious service is enhanced (xiii. 1 sqq., i. 5). Though upon consecration the bread and wine are only such in appearance, yet not all symbols are merely appearances, and these as symbols cover the real presence as content.

The explanation of Radbert's position in holding at once such opposite views is found in his attachment to the literal authority of the Scriptures. Christ's words, "This is my body," are to be taken in the crassest literalness. Christ has only one body and if another body be offered in the sacrament than the crucified one, another blood than what was shed, then its partaking could not effect the forgiveness of sins. The historical body is the indispensable basis of the sacramental body, howsoever spiritual the sacramental mystery. Moreover, Christ abides in the believer by the unity of his flesh and blood which must be sustained by the real presence in the sacrament. These two disparate views of the patristic tradition Radbertus approximated but never successfully fused. This remained for the strenuous efforts of the later centuries, as evidenced in the following elements of the resulting dogma: (1) The body of Christ is not created but becomes present in the consecration though without extension in space; (2) the relation of the presence to the sensible properties is posited under the categories of substance and accidents; and (3) the elements are symbols of the presence and the sacramental body is symbol of the mystical body, the sustenance of both in one constituting the blessing. Two of his contemporaries opposed the view of Radbert, namely, Rabanus Maurus and Ratramnus (qq.v.), both of whom were Augustinian. The former took offense at the transformation of the elements into the historical body of Christ, denying that the mystery identified the sacramental with the historical body. A great many followed along the lines marked out by Radbert, among whom, of the ninth century, were Florus Magister, subdeacon of Reims, Hincmar of Reims, Remigius (qq.v.), and Pseudo-Alcuin. (A. Hauck.)

Influence.

Bibliography: Sirmondi's ed. of the *Opera*, Paris, 1618, reproduced in *MPL*, cxx., is incomplete. The *Epistolæ* are in *MGH, Epist.*, vi. 132 sqq.; and the poems in *MGH, Poet. Lat. ævi Car.*, iii (1886), 38–53. The *Vita* by Engelmodus, with other material, is in *ASB*, Apr., iii. 463–464, cf. Holder-Egger in *MGH, Script.*, xv. 1 (1887), 452–454. For other lives cf. *ASM*, iv. 2, pp. 122–136, 567–569. The *Carmen* by Engelmodus is in *MGH, Poet. Lat. ævi Car.*, iii (1886), 62–66. Consult further: J. C. F. Bähr, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur im karolingischen Zeitalter*, pp. 233, 462–471, Carlsruhe, 1840; M. Hausherr, *Der heilige Paschasius Radbertus*, Mainz, 1862; Sardemann, *Der theologische Lehrgehalt der Schriften des Paschasius Radbertus*, Marburg, 1877; E. Dümmler, in *NA*, iv (1879), 301–305; A. Ebert, *Geschichte der Literatur des Mittelalters*, ii. 230, Leipsic, 1880; E. Choisy, *Paschase Radbert*, Geneva, 1889; J. Ernst, *Die Lehre des Paschasius Radbertus von der Eucharistie*, Freiburg, 1896; *Histoire littéraire de la France*, v. 287 sqq.; Harnack, *Dogma*, v. 276, 310, 312 sqq., vi. 47, 51, 312; Neander, *Christian Church*, vol. iii. passim; Schaff, *Christian Church*, iv. 741–745 et passim; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, xii. 528–555.

RADE, rā'de, **PAUL MARTIN:** German Lutheran; b. at Rennersdorf (a village near Herrnhut, 9 m. n.w. of Zittau), Silesia, Apr. 4, 1857. He was educated at the University of Leipsic (1875–1879), was private tutor (1879–81), and pastor at Schönbach-bei-Löbau (1882–92), and at St. Paul's, Frankfort (1892–99). In 1899 he removed to Marburg, where he became privat-docent in 1900, and associate professor of systematic theology in 1904. Besides editing the *Christliche Welt*, which he founded in 1886, and being assistant editor of *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, he has written *Damasus, Bischof von Rom* (Freiburg, 1882); *Bedarf Luther wider Janssen der Verteidigung?* (Leipsic, 1883); *Reden über Trunksucht* (Dresden, 1884); *Dr Martin Luthers Leben, Taten, und Meinungen* (3 vols., Neustadt, 1883–87); *Hutten und Sickingen* (Barmen, 1887); *Die Konfessionen und die soziale Frage* (Leipsic, 1891); *Unsere Landegemeinden und das Gemeindeideal* (1891); *Der rechte evangelische Glaube* (1892); *Spener in Frankfurt* (Frankfort, 1893); *Zu Christus hin* (Freiburg, 1897); *Die Religion im modernen Geistesleben* (1898); *Religion und Moral* (Giessen, 1898); *Die religiös-sittliche Gedankenwelt unserer Industriearbeiter* (Göttingen, 1898); *Die Wahrheit der christlichen Religion* (Tübingen, 1899); *Reine Lehre, eine Forderung des Glaubens und nicht des Rechtes* (1900); *Die Leitsätze der ersten und zweiten Auflagen von Schleiermachers Glaubenslehre* (1904); *Unbewusstes Christentum* (1905); *Das religiöse Wunder und anderes* (1909); and *Die Stellung des Christentums zum Geschlechtsleben* (1910).

RADEWYNS, FLORENTIUS. See Florentius Radewyns.

RAEBIGER, rê'big-er, **JULIUS FERDINAND:** German theologian; b. at Lohsa (42 m. n.e. of Dresden) Apr. 20, 1811; d. at Breslau Nov. 18, 1891. He studied at Breslau and Leipsic; entered the faculty at Breslau in 1838; was associate professor, 1847–59; and professor after 1859. He lectured on Old- and New-Testament theology and on theological encyclopedia. Opposed to extremes in theological position, he represented a middle ground of independence and reality in theology as well as church affairs. He published the *Kritische Untersuchungen über den Inhalt der beiden Briefe an die Korinther Gemeinde* (Breslau, 1847; 2d ed., 1886); *De Christologia Paulina contra Baurium* (1852); and *De libri Jobi sententia primaria* (1860). His main work was *Theologik oder Encyklopädie der Theologie* (Leipsic, 1880; Eng. transl., *Encyclopedia of Theology*, 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1884–85), in which he held forth that, viewing theology as an independent science, encyclopedia is neither a mechanical grouping of the departments of theology nor a mere methodology, but an independent organic unity, touching in its circumference the whole sphere of knowledge. (Julius Decke.)

RAFFLES, rāf'elz, THOMAS: English Independent; b. at London May 17, 1788; d. at Liverpool Aug. 18, 1863. He studied at Homerton College, 1805–09; was pastor at Hammersmith, London, 1809–11; and at Liverpool, 1811–62. His ministry here was one of great usefulness and his position for a half a century a commanding one. He was one of the founders of Blackburn Academy for the education of Independent ministers, removed afterward to Manchester as the Lancashire Independent College. He published *Memoirs of the Life and Ministry of Thomas Spencer* (Liverpool, 1813; 7th ed., 1836); and *Lectures on Practical Religion* (1820). He contributed eight selections of his own to *Hymns* by W. B. Collyer (London, 1812), and arranged a *Supplement to Dr. Watts's Psalms and Hymns* (1853), including those and thirty-eight others, one of which was "High in yonder realms of light."

Bibliography: T. S. Raffles, *Memoirs of the Life and Ministry of . . . T. Raffles*, London, 1864 (by his son); J. B. Brown, *T. Raffles, . . a Sketch*, ib. 1863; S. W. Duffield, *English Hymns*, pp. 561–562, New York, 1886; Julian, *Hymnology*, pp. 948–949.

RAGG, LONSDALE: Church of England; b. at Wellington (10 m. e. of Shrewsbury), Shropshire, Oct. 23, 1866. He received his education at Christ Church, Oxford (B.A., 1889; M.A., 1892; B.D., 1905), and at Cuddesdon Theological College; was made deacon in 1890 and priest in 1891; curate of All Saints', Oxford, 1890; tutor and lecturer at Christ Church, 1891–95; vice-principal of Cuddesdon Theological College, 1895–98; warden of the Bishop's Hostel, Lincoln, and vice-chancellor of Lincoln Cathedral, 1899–1903; winter chaplain at Bologna, 1904–05; British chaplain at Venice, 1905 sqq.; prebendary of Buckden in Lincoln Cathedral. He has edited II Samuel for *Books of the Bible* (London, 1898); and has written: *Aspects of the Atonement. Atoning Sacrifice illustrated from various sacrificial Types of Old Testament, and from successive Stages of Christian Thought* (1904); *Christ and our Ideals; Message of the Fourth Gospel to our Day* (1906); *Dante and his Italy* (1907); *The Mohammedan Gospel of Barnabas* (1907; jointly with Laura M. Ragg); *The Church of the Apostles. Being an Outline of the History of the Church of the Apostolic Age* (1909); and *The Book of Books; a Study of the Bible* (1910).

RAHAB, rē'hab: A Canaanitic woman of Jericho, who received the spies sent by Joshua. It is stated in Josh. ii. 1–21 that Rahab, a prostitute, received into her house in Jericho the two spies sent by Joshua to reconnoiter the enemy's country. When the messengers of the king of Jericho arrived at Rahab's house to arrest these spies, she first concealed them and then aided them to escape, asking as a reward that she and her family should be spared if Jericho fell into the hands of the Israelites: as a token of recognition she received a red thread to hang from her window. This promise was kept when Jericho was taken, and Rahab and her family were received into the community of Israel.

Not only did the Jews dislike to bring their ancestors into contact with a prostitute, but some Christian expositors have also taken pains to give the word *zonah* or its Greek equivalent *pornē*, another explanation, although these words always signify prostitute. Josephus (*Ant.*, V., i. 2, 7) describes Rahab as the hostess of an inn. Jewish tradition asserted that eight prophets were descended from her (J. Lightfoot, *Horæ Hebraicæ*, on Matt. i. 5). She was said to have married either Joshua himself or else Salma, thus becoming the mother of Boaz and therefore an ancestor of David. The latter supposition seems to be accepted by the genealogy of Jesus in Matt. i. 2–19 (cf. I Chron. ii. 4 sqq.; Jerome, on Matt. i. 5). The author of the epistle to the Hebrews offers Rahab as an example of faith, and in James ii. 25 she illustrates the value of good works. Finally, Clement of Rome (*I Epist.*, i. 12) sees in the red cord a symbol of salvation by the blood of Christ. (R. Kittel.)

Bibliography: Besides the commentaries on the passages cited in the text from the Old and New Testaments, and the works on Hebrew history cited under Ahab, and Israel, History of, consult: A. Wünsche, *Neue Beiträge zur Erläuterung der Evangelium aus Talmud und Midrasch*, pp. 3–4, Göttingen, 1878; F. Weber, *System der altsynagogalen palästinischen Theologie*, p. 318, Leipsic, 1880; *DB*, iv. 193–194; *EB*, iv. 4007; *JE*, x. 309; Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire*, xxxiii. 934–936.

RAHLFS, rālfs, OTTO GUSTAV ALFRED: German Protestant; b. at Linden (now a part of Hanover) May 29, 1865. He was educated at the universities of Halle and Göttingen (Ph.D., 1887), was inspector of the theological seminary at Göttingen (1888–90), became privat-docent at the university of the same city in 1891, titular professor in 1896, and associate professor of Old-Testament exegesis and Hebrew in 1901. He has written *Des Gregorius Abulfarag Anmerkungen zu den salomonischen Schriften* (Leipsic, 1887); *Anī und Anāw in den Psalmen* (Göttingen, 1891); *Die Berliner-Handschrift des sahidischen Psalters* (Berlin, 1901); and *Septuaginta-Studien*, vols. i.–ii. (Göttingen, 1904–07). He is also an editor of the *Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, and of the *Theologische Litteraturzeitung*.

RAHTMANN, rāt'mān, HERMANN: German theologian; b. at Lübeck in 1585; d. at Danzig June 30, 1628. After a course in theology at Rostock, he went to Cologne to study the learning and dialectics of the Jesuits, then to Frankfort and Leipsic to continue his studies in philosophy and theology and to give instruction. In 1612 he received a call as deacon to St. John's Church in Danzig; in 1617 he became deacon at St. Mary's Church, and in 1626 pastor of St. Catherine's Church.

His idealism, in Scriptural dogmatic form, is comprised in *Jesu Christi: dess Königs aller Könige und Herrn aller Herren Gnadenreich* (Danzig, 1621), composed of collocated Bible sentences, with headings of the various chapters and a very few marginal notes. Rahtmann's theological and historical position finds its peculiar significance in answering the questions, "What Holy Scripture is; whence comes it; and what is its effect?" He derives the Scriptures from divine revelation, not from the inner light of reason. The direct recipients of Scripture were the apostles and prophets, among whom the Spirit also inwardly remained. Scripture, then, "is a divine outward word or witness of God's holy will and acts, as revealed by the Holy Ghost through

a supernal illumination within the hearts of the holy Prophets and Apostles" (*Gnadenreich*, a, iii. 2r). According to Rahtmann, whose affiliations in thought are with Schwenckfeld, a sharp distinction is to be drawn between the inward and the outward word in the way of "cause and effect," or "sign and thing signified." Moreover, the Scriptures can not yield more than essentially and potentially belongs to them; they are a beckoning or guiding "hand by the way, whose operation is just this, and no more, that one knows whither he is to go" (*Gnadenreich*, 6r). So Scripture is only an index and a witness of grace. It addresses itself exclusively to the understanding, and creates in the same the conception of religious objects. If Scripture is to become the actual means of grace, another power, the Holy Ghost, must supervene; in fact, both Scripture and man are alike objects of the illuming operation of the Spirit. In Rahtmann's theology the testimony of the Holy Spirit becomes an independent, immediate act of the Spirit. This "preventive," or antecedent grace is "a voluntary gift which God accords to those whom he, like a loving father, has destined from eternity to dispose for conversion" (*Gnadenreich*, a, iii., v.). This is a contingent approach to the doctrine of predestination. In Rahtmann's later apologetic writings there are no advancements, but only attenuations and veilings of his fundamental thoughts. Among these, his valuation of Scripture as fountain of knowledge is orthodox, while his doctrine of inspiration reflects influences from Schwenckfeld and Arndt. His thought as to antecedent grace appears rooted in Augustine. In so far as he assigns the operation of grace to the Spirit, Rahtmann coincides with Schwenckfeld. By disavowing the permanent immanence of the Spirit in the word, Rahtmann was in accord with Luther and nearly all the Lutheran theology down to that time; but in that he could not apprehend Scripture to be an effectual vehicle of the divine grace, he fell away from the religious type of Lutheranism.

Because of the views above set forth, Rahtmann became the object of vehement attacks. His significance in the history of theology inheres in the fact that he, for the first time, made the divine Word, in its aspect of a means of grace, the main theme of theological discussion, and thus led the way toward creating a specific and formally elaborated doctrine of this matter within the pale of Lutheran orthodoxy. R. H. GRÜTZMACHER.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: R. H. Grützmacher, *Wort und Geist*, pp. 220–261, Leipsic, 1902; G. Arnold, *Fortsetzung . der . . . Kirchen- und Ketzer-Historie*, Frankfort, 1729; J. G. Walch, *Einleitung in die Religionsstreitigkeiten der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirchen*, parts i. and iv., Leipsic, 1733–1739; Engelhardt, in *ZHT*, 1854; E. Schnaase, *Geschichte der evangelischen Kirche Danzigs*, Danzig, 1863. For an outline of Rahtmann's works and of those which were in criticism of them cf. J. Moller, *Cimbria literata*, vol. iii., Copenhagen, 1744; J. G. Walch, *Bibliotheca theologia selecta*, vol. ii., Jena, 1758.

RAIKES, rêks, ROBERT: Founder of Sunday-schools; b. at Gloucester Sept. 14, 1735; d. there Apr. 5, 1811. His father was a printer and the publisher of the *Gloucester Journal;* at his death in 1757 the son Robert succeeded to the business. The latter manifested an interest in philanthropic movements, and in 1768 inserted in his paper an appeal in behalf of the prisoners at Gloucester. John Howard (q.v.) visited Gloucester in 1773 and spoke favorably of him. His attention was early drawn to neglect in the training of children. The suggestion upon which he started his movement is variously described. He himself mentions an interview with a woman who pointed out a crowd of idle ragamuffins, and he is said to have taken a hint from a dissenter, William King, who had set up a Sunday-school at Dursley. With Thomas Stock, a curate of a neighboring parish, who had started a Sunday-school at Ashbury, Berkshire, he engaged a woman as teacher of a school at a shilling and sixpence weekly. Raikes afterward established a school in his own parish, St. Mary le Crypt, July, 1780, a notice of the success of which he published in his paper, Nov., 1783, arousing many inquiries. This became the starting-point for a far-reaching movement. By 1786 it was said that 200,000 children were being taught in English Sunday-schools, and in Apr., 1785, a London society was organized for the establishment of these institutions, which ten years later had 65,000 scholars. The movement spread rapidly, gaining favor within and without the churches. At Christmas, 1787, Raikes was admitted to an interview with the queen, which resulted in the opening of schools which were graciously visited by George III., and copied by Hannah More (q.v.) in Somerset. Raikes owes his fame as the founder of Sunday-schools to the development of a sense of the need for instruction for children and to his use of his position as publicist in spreading a knowledge of his cheap and successful expedient.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A. Gregory, *Robert Raikes, Journalist and Philanthropist. Hist. of the Origin of Sunday Schools*, London, 1877 (from original sources); J. Ivimey, *Memoir of William Fox*, London, 1831; G. Webster, *Memoir of R. Raikes*, Nottingham, 1873; P. M. Eastman, *Robert Raikes and Northamptonshire Sunday Schools*, London, 1880; *Robert Raikes: the Man and his Work. Biographical Notices collected by Josiah Harris*, ed. J. H. Harris, London, 1899; J. H. Harris, *Robert Raikes*, London, 1900; *DNB*, xlvii. 168–170; and the literature under SUNDAY-SCHOOLS.

RAIMUNDUS, raɪ'mŭn'dŭs, DE SABUNDE (RAYMUND SABIEUDE): Spanish physician and educator; b. at Barcelona toward the close of the fourteenth century; d. at Toulouse in 1437. He was a teacher of medicine and philosophy and later of theology at Toulouse 1430–32, and rector of the high school at that place until 1437. Trithemius places the time of his literary activity c. 1430. His fame rests upon a remarkable religious philosophical work, the earliest Parisian manuscript (in translation) of which places the date of the original at 1434–36. Originally in Spanish, it appeared in a Latin translation, *Theologia naturalis seu liber creaturarum* (first, as *Liber naturæ sive creaturarum*, about 1484; Deventer, before 1488; Strasburg, 1496; French transl., by M. de Montaigne, *La Théologie naturelle*, Paris, 1569). The theology of the Middle Ages had been dominated by the distinction made by Augustine between "light of nature" and "light of grace." The latter, more or less in the ascendency, supported itself by a Platonic, realistic formulation, giving to reason a place for logical

guidance, metaphysical cognition (even of the idea of God), and ethical instinct (Anselm, Aquinas). Formal dogmatism came to deny to speculation the liberty to investigate on its own account; but emboldened by the Arabian Aristotelian philosophy, speculation arrayed itself against dogmatism, with the result that reason and faith were ranged as irreconcilable opposites (William of Occam, q.v.). Reason was reduced to the office of mere formal dialectic, while theology was represented as having nothing to do with reason and no claim to classification, but at most to an insight into incomprehensible articles of belief. At this point arose natural theology to effect a union in the divided field of human thought, by providing a rational substructure to the doctrines of revelation.

While orthodoxy represented faith and knowledge, grace and reason, doctrine and self-knowledge, as antitheses only for imperfect human thinking, yet by its deficient methods it never consummated their harmony. Moreover, in Spain scholastics, in combating Islam, borrowed the weapons of their erudite antagonists. Close internal resemblance indicates that Raimund de Sabunde was preceded in method and object by Raymund Lully (see Lully, Raymund). Not employing the term "natural theology" himself, his work must not be confused with modern representations of the same title. Far from implying a separation of the rational and the illumination of faith, and not disavowing the necessity of the latter, he takes over the main body of traditional theology. After the medieval method, separating neither the dogmatic from the ethical nor the natural from the supernatural, he, nevertheless, exceeded all previous similar efforts in clearness and unity of presentation. What is new and epoch-making is not the material but the method; not of circumscribing religion within the limits of reason, but, by logical collation, of elevating the same upon the basis of natural truth to a science accessible and convincing to all. He recognizes two sources of knowledge, the book of nature and the Bible. The first is universal and direct, the other serves partly to instruct man the better to understand nature, and partly to reveal new truths, not accessible to the natural understanding, but once revealed by God made apprehensible by natural reason. As to subject matter the two cover the same ground. The book of nature, the contents of which are manifested through sense experience and self-consciousness, can no more be falsified than the Bible and may serve as an exhaustive source of knowledge; but through the fall of man it was rendered obscure, so that it became incapable of guiding to the real wisdom of salvation. However, the Bible as well as illumination from above, not in conflict with nature, enables one to reach the correct explanation and application of natural things and self. Hence, his book of nature as a human supplement to the divine Word is to be the basic knowledge of man, because it subtends the doctrines of Scripture with the immovable foundations of self-knowledge, and therefore plants the revealed truths upon the rational ground of universal human perception, internal and external.

The first part presents analytically the facts of nature in ascending scale to man, the climax; the second, the harmonization of these with Christian doctrine and their fulfilment in the same. Nature in its four stages of mere being, mere life, sensible consciousness, and self-consciousness, is crowned by man, who is not only the microcosm but the image of God. Nature points toward a supernatural creator possessing in himself in perfection all properties of the things created out of nothing (the cornerstone of natural theology ever after). Foremost is the ontological argument of Anselm, followed by the physico-theological, psychological, and moral. He demonstrates the Trinity by analogy from rational grounds, and finally ascribes to man in view of his conscious elevation over things a spontaneous gratitude to God. Love is transformed into the object of its affection; and love to God brings man, and with him the universe estranged by sin, into harmony and unity with him. In this he betrays his mystical antecedents. Proceeding in the second part from this general postulation to its results for positive Christianity, he finds justified by reason all the historic facts of revealed religion, such as the person and works of Christ, as well as the infallibility of the Church and the Scriptures; and the necessity by rational proof of all the sacraments and practises of the Church and of the pope. It should be added that Raimund's analysis of nature and self-knowledge is not thoroughgoing and his application is far from consistent. He does not transplant himself to the standpoint of the unbeliever, but rather executes an apology on the part of a consciousness already Christian, thus assuming conclusions in advance that should grow only out of his premises. This accounts for his forced defense of a long array of Catholic institutions, alongside of his rational justification of the doctrines of redemption and ethics, such as indeed can be founded neither on the book of nature nor the Bible. In his zeal to unify reason and faith, their deeper antitheses remained for him undiscovered. Yet his is a long step from the barren speculation of scholasticism, and marks the dawn of a knowledge based on Scripture and reason. [Michael Servetus (q.v.) was deeply indebted to Raimundus. Cf. R. Willis, *Servetus and Calvin*, pp. 12 sqq. (London, 1877). A. H. N.] (K. Schaarschmidt.)

Bibliography: F. Holberg, *De theologia naturali Raymundi de Sabunde*, Halle, 1843; D. Matzke, *Die natürliche Theologie des Raymundus von Sabunde*, Breslau, 1846; Rothe, *Dissertatio de Raymundo de Sabunde*, Zurich, 1846; M. Huttler, *Die Religionsphilosophie des Raimund von Sabunde*, Augsburg, 1851; C. C. L. Kleiber, *De Raymundi vita et scriptis*, Berlin, 1856; F. Nitzsch, in *ZHT*, 1859, pp. 393–435; O. Zöckler, *Theologia naturalis*, i. 40–46, Frankfort, 1860; A. Stückl, *Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters*, ii. 1055–78, Mainz, 1865; D. Beulet, *Un inconner celèbre; recherches historiques et critiques sur Raymond de Sabunde*, Paris, 1875; F. Cicchetti-Suriani, *Sopra Raim. S., teologo, filosofo e medico del secolo xv.*, Aquila, 1889; J. E. Erdmann, *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie*, i. 444–459, Berlin, 1878, Eng. transl., London, 1893; *KL*, x. 757–758.

RAINBOW BIBLE. See Bible Text, I., 3, § 4.

RAINOLDS, JOHN. See Reynolds (Rainolds), John.

RAINSFORD, rênz'fōrd, **WILLIAM STEPHEN:** Protestant Episcopalian; b. in Dublin, Ireland, Oct. 30, 1850. He received his education at St. John's College, Cambridge (B.A., 1872); was curate of St. Giles, Norwich, England, 1873–76; traveled in the United States and Canada as missionary; was assistant rector of St. James Cathedral, 1876–83; and rector of St. George's Church, New York, 1883–1905. He is the author of *Sermons Preached in St. George's Church* (New York, 1887); *The Church's Opportunity in the City Today* (1895); *Good Friday Meditation* (1901); *Reasonableness of Faith and Other Addresses* (1902); *A Preacher's Story of his Work* (1904); and *The Land of the Lion* (1909).

RAINY, ROBERT: United Free Church of Scotland; b. at Glasgow Jan. 1, 1826; d. at Melbourne, Australia, Dec. 21, 1906. He was educated at the university of his native city (M.A., 1843) and New College, Edinburgh (graduated 1848). He was minister of the Free Church at Huntly, Aberdeenshire (1851–54), and of the Free High Church, Edinburgh (1854–62); professor of church history in New College (1862–1900), and principal after 1874. In theology he was an Evangelical Protestant, and was the leader in the union of the Free and the United Presbyterian churches of Scotland. He wrote *Life of William Cunningham* (in collaboration with J. Mackenzie; London, 1871); *Three Lectures on the Church of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1872); *The Delivery and Development of Christian Doctrine* (Cunningham lectures; 1874); *The Bible and Criticism* (London, 1878); *The Epistle to the Philippians* (1893); and *The Ancient Catholic Church* (Edinburgh, 1902).

Bibliography: P. C. Simpson, *The Life of Principal Rainy*, 2 vols., London, 1909; R. Mackintosh, *Principal Rainy, a Biographical Study*, ib. 1907.

RALEIGH, rō'le, **ALEXANDER:** Congregationalist; b. at The Flock (a farmhouse near Castle Douglas, 65 m. s. of Glasgow), Scotland, Jan. 3, 1817; d. in London Apr. 19, 1880. He came of Covenanting stock; when fifteen years of age was apprenticed to a draper; in 1835 removed to Liverpool, where he began to study for the ministry, entering Blackburn College in 1840; he became pastor of the church at Greenock 1845, but ill-health compelled his resignation in 1847, and for two years he traveled in search of health; in 1850 he accepted a call to Rotherham; then removed to the charge of the West George Street Independent Chapel, Glasgow, 1855; and in 1858 became pastor of Hare Court Chapel, Canonbury, London, and soon rose to eminence and great usefulness; in 1865 he was one of the English delegates to the National Council of Congregational Churches held at Boston, where his tact was displayed and his fine sense received recognition. He was twice president of the Congregational Union, in 1868 and in 1879; in 1876 he became pastor of the Kensington Congregational Church. He was the author of: *Quiet Resting Places and Other Sermons* (Edinburgh, 1863); *The Story of Jonah the Prophet* (1866); *Christianity and Modern Progress* (London, 1868); *The Little Sanctuary, and Other Meditations* (1872); *The Book of Esther* (Edinburgh, 1880); *Thoughts for the Weary and the Sorrowful* (ed. his wife, Mary Raleigh; 2 series, 1882–1884); *From Dawn to the Perfect Day. Sermons* (1883). Some of these passed through many editions.

Bibliography: Mary Raleigh, *Alexander Raleigh, Records of his Life*, Edinburgh, 1881; *DNB*, xlvii. 207–208.

RAMABAI, ram'ɑ-bai, **SARASVATI:** Hindu educator; b. in 1858 in the forests of Southern India, the daughter of a learned Brahmin, Ananta Shastri. Her father had educated her mother and then his two daughters and his son in Indian lore, and Ramabai, being remarkably gifted, so drank in this knowledge that, while still young, she became a pundit. Her father was once comparatively rich, but lost his property and also became blind. In poverty, oftentimes in dire need, the family led a wandering life and Ramabai saw her parents and her sister, who was older than she, die of starvation. She and her brother became lecturers upon the importance of female education, and their fortunes improved. But then he died and Ramabai was left alone. However, she had by that time acquired quite a reputation, and was received with honor in the highest circles. In 1880 she married in Calcutta Bipin Bihari Medhavi, a fellow of Calcutta University and a practising lawyer. In nineteen months she was a widow, with an infant daughter. She then resumed her lecturing on behalf of the education of Indian women and in Poona established the Areja Mahita Somaj, a society of ladies with this object and that of discouraging child-marriage. In 1883 she went to England. There she was converted and for three years taught Sanscrit in the Ladies' College at Cheltenham. In 1886 she visited America and raised much money by lecturing and through the associations which her friends formed, so that on her return to India in 1889 she was able to realize her ambition and to open in Bombay an unsectarian school for high-caste Hindu girls, especially child-widows. This school she removed to Poona in 1891. She carries it on without any religious tests, but, as was to be expected, many of her pupils have become Christians. Its influence has been most beneficent.

Bibliography: Pundita Ramabai Sarasvati, *The High-Caste Hindu Woman*, new ed., London, 1890; Helen S. Dyer, *Pandita Ramabai: The Story of her Life*, New York, 1900, 2d ed., 1910.

RAMADAN: The ninth month of the Mohammedan year, observed as a fast. According to Surah ii. of the Koran the method of observance is total abstinence from food during the day, but eating may be indulged during the night and until it is possible to distinguish a white thread from a black one by natural light. It is customary for the leisure classes to make the daytime a period for sleep, the nights being seasons of feasting and revelry. The three days following the fast are days of feasting, and are called the Little Beiram. See Mohammed, Mohammedanism, IV., § 3.

RAMANUJA. Hindu philosopher. See India, I., 2, § 2.

RAMBACH, rām'bāh: A Thuringian family of theologians.

1. Johann Jacob: B. at Halle Feb. 24, 1693; d. at Giessen Apr. 19, 1735. After a period of study

at the University of Halle, in the summer of 1715, he assisted Johann Heinrich Michaelis in the preparation of his Hebrew Bible. As a result of these labors commentaries by Rambach on Ruth, Ecclesiastes, Esther, Nehemiah, and II Chronicles were published in the *Uberiores annotationes in hagiographos V T. libros*. In 1719 Rambach went to Jena and continued his studies under Franz Buddeus. He at the same time qualified as an instructor and gave exegetical lectures that were received with great enthusiasm. He also included dogmatic theology in his instruction, and began his extensive literary activities. In 1723 he was called as a member of the theological faculty at Halle and was made full professor in 1727, where he lectured to large classes and preached on alternate Sundays. He accepted, in 1731, the position of first professor of theology and first superintendent at Giessen, and in 1732 was made director of the Pädagogium at Giessen.

Rambach was an exceptionally learned and industrious theologian, whose numerous productions went through many editions. This popularity may be explained by the position that he took between Pietism and the Wolfian philosophy. His religious and theological thinking took its start from Pietism, but he had in addition a love of science and system and a spiritual independence and moderation that were foreign to Pietistic circles, and these qualities he owed to Wolf's influence. His sermons have been regarded as models.

Rambach has also significance as a hymnologist. He not only made collections but wrote many hymns. His poetic talent was not slight. The best of his productions are marked by depth of thought and of feeling, and no small number may be counted as the best of the time.

The works for which he is most celebrated are *Introductio historico-theologica in epistolam Pauli ad Romanos* (Halle, 1727); *Commentatio hermeneutica de sensus mystici criteriis* (Jena, 1728); *Exercitationes hermeneuticæ* (1728); *Commentatio theologica* (2d ed., Halle, 1732); *Collegium historiæ ecclesiasticæ Veteris Testamenti* (2 vols., Frankfort, 1737); *Collegium introductorium historico-theologicum* (2 vols., Halle, 1738). But the most celebrated are his *Betrachtungen* which cover several phases of the life and death of Christ, collected in various editions, one of the latest being *Betrachtungen über das ganze Leiden Christi und die sieben letzten Worte des gekreuzigten Jesu* (Basel, 1865; partial Eng. transl. of earlier issue, *Meditations and Contemplations on the Sufferings of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*, 2 vols., London, 1763; abridgments or excerpts, London, 1760, York, 1819, and London, 1827).

2. Friedrich Eberhard: B. at Pfullendorf near Gotha 1708; d. at Breslau Aug. 16, 1775. He and Johann Jacob (above) had the same great grandfather, and his father was Georg Heinrich Rambach, pastor at Pfullendorf. After studying theology at Halle, he taught in the Francke Pädagogium (1730). In 1734 he went to Cönnern as associate pastor, and in 1736 was appointed pastor at Teupitz. His fame as a preacher steadily rose. In 1740 he was diakonus at the Marktkirche, Halle; in 1745 he preached at the Heiligengeistkirche in Magdeburg; in 1751, was chief preacher at the cathedral; in 1756, first pastor of the Marktkirche, Halle, and inspector of the district of the Saal; and in 1766 he went to Breslau as chief counselor of the consistory and inspector of the principality of Breslau. He was an able philologist, well versed in theological science and a faithful servant of the church. He translated works on church history and theology into German from the English and French, prefixing exhaustive prefaces. His work in this field was of undeniable service to German theologians.

3. Johann Jacob II.: Son of the preceding; b. at Teupitz (25 m. s. of Berlin) Mar. 27, 1737; d. at Ottensen (a suburb of Hamburg) Aug. 6, 1818. He studied theology at Halle; taught in gymnasiums, 1759–1774, and was rector at Quedlinburg and chief preacher. In 1780 he became head pastor of St. Michaelis at Hamburg and in 1801 senior of the ministerium. As a theologian he stood in opposition to most of his contemporaries, holding fast to the Lutheran confession. Of his writings, mainly sermons, his *Versuch einer pragmatischen Litterarhistorie* (Halle, 1770) deserves special mention.

4. August Jacob: Son of the preceding; b. at Quedlinburg (40 m. s.e. of Brunswick) May 28, 1777; d. at Ottensen Sept. 7, 1851. He studied theology at Halle; on his return to Hamburg became, in 1802, diakonus at the church of St. Jacobi; in 1818, he succeeded his father as chief pastor at St. Michaelis; and in 1834 became senior of the ministerium. He became interested in hymnology at an early date, the first important result of his studies being *Ueber Dr. Martin Luthers Verdienst um den Kirchengesang* (Hamburg, 1813). His *Anthologie christlicher Gesänge aus allen Jahrhunderten* (6 vols., Altona and Leipsic, 1817–33) is a reliable work and is still indispensable in hymnological investigations. During the years 1833–42, Rambach, with five colleagues, produced a hymnbook which is still used in Hamburg. His hymnological collections were given by his widow to the Hamburg city library. (CARL BERTHEAU.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: In general consult: T. Hansen, *Die Familie Rambach*, Gotha, 1875; Julian, *Hymnology*, pp. 949–951. On 1 consult: the autobiography in *Hessisches Hebopfer*, part vi., pp. 617 sqq., Giessen, 1735; J. P. Fresenius, *Die wohlbelohnte Treue . als J J. Rambach geschieden*, Giessen, 1736 (funeral sermon, with sketch of the life by E. F. Neubauer); D. Büttner, *Lebenslauf des J. J. Rambach*, Frankfort, 1735; E. E. Koch, *Geschichte des Kirchenliedes*, iv. 521 sqq., 3d ed., Stuttgart, 1869; R. Rothe, *Geschichte der Predigt*, ed. Trümpelmann, pp. 408 sqq., Bremen, 1881; *ADB*, xxvii. 196 sqq. On 2 consult: J. J. Rambach (II.), *Leben und Charakter F. E. Rambachs*, Halle, 1775; J. M. H. Döring, *Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands*, iii. 427 sqq., Neustadt, 1833; *ADB*, xxviii. 763–764. On 3 consult: A. J. Rambach, *J. J. Rambach, nach seinem Leben und Verdienst geschildert*, Hamburg, 1818; J. Geffcken, *Die grosse St. Michaeliskirche in Hamburg*, pp. 92 sqq., ib. 1862; J. H. Höck, *Bilder aus der Geschichte der hamburgischen Kirche seit der Reformation*, pp. 258 sqq., ib. 1900; *ADB*, xxvii. 201 sqq. On 4 consult: C. Petersen, *Memoria Augusti Jacobi Rambach*, Hamburg, 1856; E. E. Koch, *Geschichte des Kirchenliedes*, vii. 70, 3d ed., Stuttgart, 1872; J. Geffcken, *Die hamburgischen Niedersächsischen Gesangbücher*, pp. xxvii. sqq., Hamburg, 1857; *ADB*, xxvii. 193 sqq

RAMMAN. See ASSYRIA, VII., § 4.

RAMMOHAN ROY, ram-mo-han': Hindu theist; b. at Radhanagar in Bengal, May 22, 1772 or 1774;

d. in Bristol, England, Sept. 27, 1833. His father Ramkhant Roy, a man respected for his wealth and character, was a Vishnuite; his mother, Tarini, was the daughter of a priest of the Shakta sect. After finishing his elementary studies in Bengali, he was taught Persian, then the court language; at the age of ten he was sent to Patna to learn Arabic, and later to Benares to learn Sanskrit, returning to his father's home at about the age of fifteen. During these five years of absence he had changed his religious beliefs, accepted monotheism, and become opposed to idolatry. His father was entirely out of sympathy with these monotheistic ideas, and this opposition led Rammohan to leave his home the next year and to travel through different parts of India and even into Tibet. After about five years of wandering he was recalled by his father, but again left his home to reside in Benares, where he gained an extensive knowledge of Sanskrit, and still later learned to use English with accuracy and fluency. His first literary effort was in Persian, with the Arabic title *Tahfat-al-Muwahhiddin*, "A Gift to Deists," teaching that all religions have in reality a common foundation, the oneness of God, but that they differ in their interpretation of him.

In 1814 the family took up its residence in Calcutta, and in 1815 Rammohan started the *Atmiya Sabha* (see India, III., 1), a small association of kindred spirits, who, with him, engaged in the recitation of Vedic texts and theistic hymns. This association developed later into the Brahma Samaj (see India, III., 1). His activity in favor of monotheism and against idolatry was intensified by opposition. Through publications and discussions he sought to prove that polytheism and idolatry were degraded forms of Hinduism and opposed to the higher teachings of the *Vedas* and *Upanishads*. He translated many *Upanishads* into Bengali, Hindi, and English in order to prove Hinduism to be essentially monotheistic. In 1811 he had witnessed the immolation of his brother's wife. At first he tried to persuade her from her terrible intention, but in vain. When, however, she felt the flames, her courage failed, and she attempted to escape, but her relations and the priests forced her to remain in the flames, her shrieks being drowned in the loud beating of drums. This horrible cruelty so impressed Rammohan Roy, that he resolved never to rest until the custom of Suttee should be no more. He saw his efforts, with those of Christian missionaries and others, succeed with the passing of the Government of India Act against Suttee, Dec. 4, 1829.

In Dec., 1821, he started the *Sambad Kaumudi*, a weekly paper, intended to advance the intellectual and moral welfare of the people, and later, in Persian, the *Mirat-al-Akhbar*. These early efforts have given him the title of founder of native journalism in India. He has also been called the father of Bengali prose, as up to that time few Bengali prose works had appeared, and they of little merit. His prose works are mostly controversial, showing that the Shastras in their higher teachings are on the side of monotheism and against idolatry. He also composed religious songs that hold even to-day a high place in Bengali hearts.

During this period of residence in Calcutta he came much in contact with Europeans, including missionaries, and became familiar with the Bible, studying both the Hebrew and Greek. The ethics of the teachings of Christ deeply influenced him, resulting in his publishing the *Precepts of Jesus, the Guide to Peace and Happiness*. This publication was followed by an unfortunate discussion on the doctrinal side of Christianity with the Baptist missionaries of Serampore. In 1828 the *Atmiya Sabha*, which he had founded, became the *Brahma Sabha*, later known as the *Brahma Samaj*, and under its enthusiastic leader many were drawn to a theistic belief. On Jan. 23, 1830, a building was consecrated for its use. In Nov., 1830, Rammohan Roy, now Raja Rammohan Roy, a title given him in 1829 by the Emperor of Delhi, set sail for England, where he died. He is entitled to the honor of being the first modern Brahman to cross the ocean.

Justin E. Abbott.

Bibliography: The best-known of his writings is *Tahfat-al-Muwahhiddin, or, a Gift to Deists*, Eng. transl., Calcutta, 1884; his Eng. works were edited by Jogendra Chunder Ghose, 2 vols., ib. 1885–87, and appeared also with a transl. of the *Tahfat-al-Muwahhiddin*, Allahabad, 1906. For his life consult: Sophia D. Collett, *The Life and Letters of Raja Rammohan Roy*, London, 1900; the *Memoir* prefixed by T. Rees to the edition of the *Precepts of Jesus*, 1824; L. Carpenter, *Review of the Labours, Opinions and Character of Rajah Rammohan Roy*, London, 1833; W. J. Fox, *A Discourse on the Occasion of the Death of Rajah Rammohan Roy*, ib. 1833; Mary Carpenter, *The Last Days . . . of Rajah Rammohan Roy*, ib. 1866; K. S. Macdonald, *Rajah Ram Mohun Roy*, Calcutta, 1879; Nagendra Nath Chatterji, *Life of Raja Rammohan Roy*, Calcutta, 1880; Nanda Mohan Chatterji, *Some Anecdotes from the Life of Raja Rammohan Roy*, ib. 1881; *Monthly Repository of Theology and General Literature*, vols. xiii., xx.; and the literature under India.

RAMPOLLA, rām-pōl'lā, DEL TINDARO, MARIANO: Cardinal; b., of noble family, at Polizzi (40 m. s.e. of Palermo), Sicily, Aug. 17, 1843. He was educated at the Pontificia Accademia dei Nobili Ecclesiastici, Rome; was attached in 1869 to the Congregation of Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs, and shortly afterward was appointed domestic prelate to the pope. Six years later he was sent to Madrid, where he was acting papal nuncio, and in 1877 he was recalled to Rome as secretary of the Propaganda for the Oriental Rite, becoming secretary of the Congregation of Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs in 1880. In 1882 he was consecrated titular archbishop of Heraclea and returned to Madrid as nuncio, where he was able to render important services to both the papal and the Spanish governments. He was created cardinal-priest of Santa Cecilia in 1887, and is also archpriest of the Basilica and prefect of the Congregation of the Fabric, and a member of the Congregations of the Inquisition, Consistory, Propaganda, Propaganda for the Oriental Rite, Rites, Studies, and Extraordinary Ecclesiastical Affairs. From 1887 to 1903 he was papal secretary of state, and in this office sought to further the restoration of the temporal power of the pope. He has written *De cathedra Romana Beati Petri, Apostolorum principis* (Rome, 1868); *De authentico Romani Pontificis magisterio* (1870); and *Del Luogo del martirio e del sepolcro dei Maccabei* (1897).

RAMSAY, rām'zê, **SIR WILLIAM MITCHELL:** Church of Scotland layman; b. at Glasgow Mar. 15, 1851. He was educated at the universities of Aberdeen (M.A., 1871), Oxford (B.A., 1876), and Göttingen. He was Oxford University traveling scholar (1880–82), research fellow of Exeter College, Oxford (1882–87), and fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford, and professor of classical art and archeology in the University of Oxford (1885–86). Since 1886 he has been professor of humanity in the University of Aberdeen, where he was also Wilson fellow in 1901–05. He was elected honorary fellow of Exeter College in 1896 and of Lincoln College in the following year, and was lecturer in Mansfield College, Oxford, in 1891 and 1895, Levering lecturer at Johns Hopkins in 1894, Morgan lecturer at Auburn Theological Seminary in 1894, Rede lecturer in the University of Cambridge in 1906, and Gay lecturer at the Southwestern Theological Seminary in 1910. In 1880–91, 1898, and 1901–05 he traveled extensively in Asiatic Turkey, and received the gold medal of Pope Leo XIII. in 1893, the Victoria gold medal of the Royal Geographical Society, and the L. W Drexel gold medal for archeological exploration, University of Pennsylvania. He has written *Historical Geography of Asia Minor* (London, 1890); *The Church in the Roman Empire before 180 A.D.* (1893); *The Cities and Bishops of Phrygia* (2 vols., 1895–97); *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen* (1895); *Impressions of Turkey* (1897); *Was Christ born at Bethlehem?* (1898); *Historical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians* (1899); *The Education of Christ* (1902); *The Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia* (1904); *Pauline and Other Studies in Early Christian History* (1906); *The Cities of St. Paul, their Influence on his Life and Thought. The Cities of Eastern Asia Minor* (1907); *Luke the Physician, and Other Studies in the Hist. of Religion* (1908); *The Revolution in Constantinople and Turkey; a Diary* (1909); *The Thousand and One Churches* (1909; in collaboration with Gertrude L. Bell); and *Pictures of the Apostolic Church, its Life and Preaching* (1910); and has edited *Studies in the Hist. and Art of the Eastern Provinces of the Roman Empire* (1906).

RAMUS, rā-müs', **PETRUS (PIERRE DE LA RAMÉE):** French humanist; b. at Cuth, near Soissons (56 m. n.e. of Paris), 1515; d. at Paris Aug. 24, 1572. He studied at Paris under Johann Sturm, who lectured from 1529 to 1536 on the principles of Agricola. In the thesis for his master's degree, written at the age of twenty-one, *Quœcunque ab Aristotele dicta essent, commentitia esse,* Ramus asserted the fallibility of the philosopher and aroused great excitement, which was increased by the publication in 1543 of the *Aristoteliœ animadversiones* and the *Dialecticœ institutiones,* in which Ramus tried to show the inadequacy of the Aristotelian logic. Ramus' works were a protest against views like those of Peter Galland, according to which Aristotle's philosophy was in perfect accord with the Christian religion. An edict issued by Francis I. forbade Ramus to teach philosophy and consigned his books to the flames. Ramus taught rhetoric and mathematics at the college of Ave Maria until, after the death of Francis in 1545, the restraint was removed through the efforts of Charles of Lorraine, the friend and protector of Ramus. He was allowed to teach philosophy at the Collège de Presles and in 1551 was made professor at the royal college.

Ramus was converted to Protestantism in 1561 after hearing Charles attempt to answer Beza. In the summer of 1562, when the Calvinists were banished from the city, Ramus found refuge with the dowager queen at Fontainebleau until the peace of Amboise, Mar. 10, 1563, permitted him to return. He resumed his work at the college. The persecution of the Reformed on the outbreak of the second civil war compelled Ramus to flee to the Huguenot camp at St. Denis, where he joined Condé and Coligny in the war. He returned to Paris in 1568, after the peace, but the uncertainty of the situation induced him to ask leave of absence in order to visit foreign universities. He set out on his travels shortly before the outbreak of the third civil war. At Heidelberg, he occupied for a time the position of professor of ethics, but his Aristotelian opponents made his continuance in the place impossible, and in July, 1570, he returned to Paris. His former positions were occupied; he received, however, a pension from Charles IX. and Catherine de Medici, only to perish on St. Bartholomew's night.

Ramus was more humanist than philosopher. He reformed the traditional method of studying the classics, and infused life into what had been a tedious exercise, and his pedagogical method was adopted in the next century. Ramus wished also to free theology from the subtleties of scholasticism and to establish the Bible as the only standard in matters of faith. His theological views are given in his *Commentariorum de religione Christiana libri quatuor, nunquam antea editi* (with a biography by T. Banos, Frankfort, 1576). His influence was wide-spread until the latter half of the seventeenth century, when it was displaced by Cartesianism. Among his disciples were Caspar Olevianus and Johannes Piscator (qq.v.), the jurists Hieronymus Treutler and Johannes Althusius, the statesman Emdens, and John Milton. (F. W. Cunot.)

Bibliography: As sources, besides the life by Banos in *Commentariorum,* ut sup., consult: N. de Nascel, *Vie de Ramus,* Paris, 1599 (best); and J. T. Freigius, *Vita P. Rami,* in Ramus' *Prœlectiones in Ciceronis Orationes,* Basil, 1574. Consult further: T. Spencer, *The Art of Logick Delivered in the Precepts of Aristotle and Ramus,* London, 1656; A. Richardson, *The Logicians Schoolmaster; or, a Comment upon Ramus' Logick,* London, 1657; C. F. Lenz, *Lebensbeschreibung des Ramus,* Wittenberg, 1713; P. Bayle, *Dictionary Historical and Critical,* pp. 834–842. London, 1737; C. Schmidt, *La Vie et les travaux de Jean Sturm,* Strasburg, 1855; C. Waddington, *Ramus, sa vie, ses écrits et ses opinions,* Paris, 1855; É. Saisset, *Les Précurseurs de Descartes,* Paris, 1862; C. Desmaze, *P. Ramus, . . sa vie, ses écrits, sa mort,* Paris, 1864; A. Stöckl, *Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters,* iii. 296 sqq., Mainz, 1867; B. Chagnard, *Ramus et ses opinions religieuses,* Strasburg, 1869; P. Lobstein, *Petrus Ramus als Theolog,* Strasburg, 1878; J. Barni, *Les Martyres de la libre pensée,* pp. 107–135, Paris, 1880; *KL,* x. 766–767; Lichtenberger, *ESR,* xi. 100–105 (worth consulting for the very full list of the writings of Ramus); *American Journal of Education,* xxiv. 131–134, xxx. 450–464; and the works on the history of philosophy.

RANCÉ, ARMAND LOUIS LE BOUTHILLIER DE. See TRAPPISTS.

RAND, WILLIAM WILBERFORCE: Reformed (Dutch); b. at Gorham, Me., Dec. 8, 1816; d. at Yonkers Mar. 3, 1909. He was graduated from Bowdoin College, 1837, and from Bangor Theological Seminary, 1840; licensed to preach as a Congregational minister, 1840; pastor of the Dutch Reformed Church of Canastota, N. Y., 1841–44; editor for the American Tract Society, New York, 1848–72; and publishing secretary of the same, 1872–1902. He was the author of *Songs of Zion* (New York, 1851; revised and enlarged, 1865); and *Dictionary of the Bible for General Use* (1860; enlarged and largely rewritten, 1886), which was prepared on the basis of Edward Robinson's *Dictionary of the Holy Bible* (New York, 1845).

RANDALL, RICHARD WILLIAM: Church of England; b. in London Apr. 13, 1824; d. at Bournemouth (24 m. s.w. of Southampton) Dec. 23, 1906. He was educated at Christ Church, Oxford (B.A., 1846), and was ordered deacon in 1847 and ordained priest in the following year. He was curate of Binfield (1847–51), rector of Woollavington with Graffham, Sussex (1851–68), and vicar of All Saints', Clifton (1868–92); and was dean of Chichester from 1892 till his retirement from active life in 1902. He was honorary canon of Bristol after 1891 and rural dean of Chichester after 1899, and was select preacher at Oxford in 1893–94. He was author of *Life in the Catholic Church* (London, 1889); *Addresses and Meditations for a Retreat* (1890); and *Some Aspects of the Holy Eucharist, Communion, Sacrifice, Worship* (1897).

RANDOLPH, ALFRED MAGILL: Protestant Episcopal bishop of southern Virginia; b. at Winchester, Va., Aug. 31, 1836. He was educated at William and Mary College, Williamsburg, Va. (B.A., 1855), and at the Theological Seminary of Virginia (graduated 1858). He was ordered deacon in 1858 and ordained priest in 1860; was rector of St. George's, Fredericksburg, Va. (1860–62), chaplain in the Confederate Army until the close of the Civil War; rector of Christ Church, Alexandria, Va. (1865–67), and of Emmanuel Church, Baltimore, Md. (1867–83). He was consecrated bishop-coadjutor of Virginia (1883), and when this diocese was divided in 1892 into the two dioceses of Virginia and Southern Virginia, he became bishop of the newly erected see. He has written *Reason, Faith, and Authority in Christianity* (New York, 1902).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: W. S. Perry, *The Episcopate in America*, p. 279, New York, 1895.

RANDOLPH, ran'dolf, **BERKELEY WILLIAM:** Church of England; b. at Riverhead (20 m. s.e. of London), Kent, Mar. 10, 1858. He was educated at Haileybury and Balliol College, Oxford (B.A., 1879), and was ordered deacon in 1881 and priested in the following year. He was fellow of St. Augustine's College, Canterbury (1880–83), and principal of St. Stephen's House, Oxford (1884–85); and domestic chaplain to the bishop of Lincoln until 1890. He was then vice-principal of Ely Theological College for a year, and since 1891 has been principal of the same institution, as well as canon of Ely and examining chaplain to the bishop of Lincoln. Theologically he describes himself as a "Prayer Book Churchman," and has written *The Law of Sinai, being devotional Addresses on the Ten Commandments* (London, 1896); *The Threshold of the Sanctuary, being short Chapters on Preparation for Holy Orders* (1897); *Meditations on the Old Testament for every Day of the Year* (1899); *The Psalms of David, with brief Notes for Use in Church or at Home* (1900); *The Example of the Passion* (1901); *Meditations on the New Testament for every Day of the Year* (1902); *The Virgin Birth of Our Lord* (1903); *Ember Thoughts* (1903); *The Empty Tomb* (1906); *Christ in the Old Testament* (1907); *Holy Eucharist—Sacrifice and Feast* (1908); and *Precious Blood of Christ* (1909); and editions of J. Keble's *Letters of Spiritual Counsel and Guidance* (London, 1904), W. Laud's *Private Devotions* (1905), and Fenelon's *Letters and Counsels* (1906).

RANKE, rän'ke, **ERNST KONSTANTIN:** German Lutheran; b. at Wiehe (27 m. w.s.w. of Merseburg), Saxony, Sept. 10, 1814; d. at Marburg July 30, 1888. He was educated at the universities of Leipsic (1834–35), Berlin (1835–36), and Bonn (1836–37), and after being a private tutor for three years was called to the pastorate of Buchau in Upper Franconia, where he began to collect materials for his studies on the ancient pericopes of the Roman Catholic Church and the Latin translations of the Bible prior to Jerome. In 1850 he was called to Marburg as professor of church history and New-Testament exegesis, holding this position until his death. Ranke was an exceptionally gifted paleographist, his most important contribution here being his *Codex Fuldensis Novi Testamenti Latine* (Marburg, 1868), in which he showed that this manuscript, next to the *Codex Amiatinus*, was the chief witness for the New Testament of Jerome. He likewise rendered valuable service by his two editions of the oldest Marburg hymnal—*Marburger Gesangbuch von 1549 mit verwandten Liederdrucken* (Marburg, 1866, 1878). He was, at the same time, an admirable Latin poet, his models being the humanists, especially Konrad Celtes and Hugo Grotius, and his best work being shown in his *Horæ lyricæ* (Vienna, 1873) and *Rhythmica* (1881). He also made a metrical translation of Tobit (Baireuth, 1847) and of selected poems of Paulus Melissus (Zurich, 1875), while his independent poems included his *Lieder aus grosser Zcit* (Marburg, 1872) and *Die Schlacht am Teutoburger Walde* (1876). Besides the works of Ranke already noted, mention may be made of the following: *Das kirchliche Perikopensystem aus den ältesten Urkunden der römischen Liturgie dargelegt und erläutert* (Berlin, 1847); *Fragmenta versionis Latinæ Antehieronymianæ prophetarum, etc., e codice Fuldensi* (4 parts, Marburg, 1856–68); *Par palimpsestorum Wirceburgensium, antiquissimæ Veteris Testamenti versionis Latinæ fragmenta* (Vienna, 1871); *Cuecensia evangelii Lucani fragmenta Latina* (Marburg, 1872); *Chorgesänge zum Preis der heiligen Elisabeth aus mittelalterlichen Antiphonarien* (Leipsic, 1883); and

Antiquissimæ Veteris Testamenti versionis Latinæ fragmenta Stutgardiana (Marburg, 1888).

(G. Heinrici.)

Bibliography: E. Hitzig, *Ernst Constantin Ranke . . Lebensbild*, Leipsic, 1906; *Chronik der Universität Marburg*, 1888–89, pp. 8–14; F. H. Ranke, *Jugenderinnerungen*, Stuttgart, 1886; G. Heinrici, *Worte der Erinnerung von E. K. Ranke*, Marburg, 1888.

RANKIN, THOMAS: Methodist, friend of John Wesley; b. at Dunbar (27 m. e.n.e. of Edinburgh), Scotland, in 1738; d. in London May 17, 1810. He came of pious parentage, and was early inclined to enter the ministry; but when seventeen and after the death of his father, he was led into evil courses, from which he was startled by the devotions of some pious soldiers; later he came under the influence of Whitefield, and again thought of entering the ministry, but instead circumstances compelled him to sail for America to engage in commercial pursuits; in 1759 he was again in his own country, accompanied a Methodist itinerant minister while visiting societies in the north of England, and then preached his first sermons. In 1761 he had interviews with John Wesley, and became officially connected with the Wesleyan movement, often accompanying the leader on his journeys; in 1773 he was sent by Wesley to America, where he called the first Methodist conference held in America, and there, in the settlement of problems, Rankin took precedence of Francis Asbury (q.v.), holding the position of "general assistant." In 1778 he was again in England and remained at work till 1783, when at his request he was made a supernumerary. His mark on Methodism is less pronounced than that of others of his time, not because he was less pious or able, but rather because of inflexibility of temperament and deficiencies of education.

Bibliography: The *Autobiography* was published in the *Arminian Magazine*, 1779. Consult further: W. B. Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, vii. 28–34, New York, 1861; and, in general, the works dealing with the early development of Methodism in England and America, mentioned under Methodists.

RANTERS: The name given by way of reproach to an antinomian sect of the Commonwealth period in England. See Antinomianism and Antinomian Controversies, I., § 6. The name was also at one time opprobriously applied to the Primitive Methodists, mainly because of the emphasis and loud tones employed in their preaching and responses. See Methodists, I., 4, IV., 9.

RAPHAEL, rê'fa-el: One of the seven (four) archangels of post-exilic Hebrew angelology (Tobit iii. 17, xii. 15; Enoch ix., xxi., xl. 2; Luke i. 19). See Angel, II., § 1.

RAPHAEL BIBLE. See Bibles, Illustrated.

RAPP, rāp, **JOHANN GEORG:** Founder of the Harmony Society; b. at Iptingen, near Vaihingen (15 m. n.w. of Stuttgart), Nov. 1, 1757; d. at Economy, Pa., Aug. 7, 1847. He was a linen-weaver by trade and early came under influences of mysticism. By 1785 he had become a separatist and held aloof from the public worship and communion of the Church. By his declaration of his views and by his eloquence he attracted thousands who flocked to Iptingen. Their open opposition to the rites of the Church, refusal to send their children to the parochial schools, and independent worship called upon himself and his adherents restrictive measures from the government, incited by the ecclesiastics; but, meanwhile (1803), Rapp had gone to America to select a site for a settlement, whither he was followed the next year by 700 of his adherents. In Butler County, Pa., he established a colony called Harmony, presumably on a primitive apostolic model, organized on the basis of a community of industry and goods, celibacy, and chiliasm. Rapp was a man of superior ability, tireless industry, sincere piety, commanding eloquence, and practical skill, which is illustrated by the phenomenal success of the enterprise for a season. For the history of the enterprise see Communism, II., 6.

Bibliography: See, in addition to the literature under Communism, II., 6, C. Palmer, *Die Gemeinschaften und Sekten Württembergs*, Tübingen, 1877; K. Knortz, *Die christlich-kommunistische Kolonie der Rappisten*, Leipsic, 1892.

RASHDALL, HASTINGS: Church of England; b. in London June 24, 1858. He was educated at New College, Oxford (B. A., 1881; M. A., 1884), and was ordered deacon in 1884 and ordained priest two years later. He was lecturer in St. David's College, Lampeter (1883–84), tutor in the University of Durham (1884–88), and fellow and lecturer of Hertford College, Oxford (1888–95). Since 1895 he has been fellow and tutor of New College, Oxford, and dean of divinity since 1903. He was chaplain and theological tutor at Balliol College, Oxford (1894–95), select preacher at Cambridge (1880–1901), and Oxford (1895–97), and preacher at Lincoln's Inn (1898–1903). In addition to contributing to *Contentio Veritatis* (London, 1902), he has written *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages* (2 vols., London, 1895); *Doctrine and Development* (university sermons; 1898); *New College* (in collaboration with R. S. Rait; 1901); *Christus in Ecclesia* (Edinburgh, 1904); *The Theory of Good and Evil* (1907); and *Philosophy and Religion* (Oxford, 1909).

RASHI, rā-shî': French rabbi, commentator on Bible and Talmud; b. at Troyes (90 m. e.s.e. of Paris) in 1040; d. there July 13, 1105. The name Rashi is made up of the vocalized initials of his title and name, Rabbi Solomon (bar) Isaac. Because of his great natural endowments, he was sent at a very early age to a talmudic school in Mainz, over which Gershom had presided, where Jacob ben Yaḳar became his teacher; later, in the high school at Worms, he was a pupil of Isaac ben Eleazar Ha-Levi and Isaac ben Judah. After his return to his native city he was appointed rabbi, filling this position without remuneration until his death, and becoming celebrated far and wide as an authority on the Talmud.

In Rashi's time the sources for a commentary on the books of the Old Testament were very meager; he was therefore compelled to utilize very imperfect studies of Menahem ben Saruḳ and Dunash ben Labraṭ. At that period the French language was still in its very beginnings, so that it was impossible for Rashi to translate the finished Hebrew into

that idiom; he was therefore forced to choose Hebrew for the expression of his ideas and theories. He wrote commentaries on all the books of the Old Testament except I and II Chronicles, Nehemiah, and the second part of Job; these were annotated by the adherents of his school. Starting with the Massoretic text, which he scrupulously followed, Rashi treats the exegetical difficulties in a clear, literal, and simple manner. He solves lexicographical problems by analogous cases and grammatical difficulties by the citation of a similar or allied form. Repeatedly he emphazises his view that the simple natural sense of the Biblical passages should be accepted, and (on Gen. iii. 8) declares as his sole purpose to explain Scripture in its literal sense; even the Song of Solomon was so treated. His desire to give the natural sense explains his frequent reference to the targum of Onkelos; wherever "according to its targum" occurs, the targum of Onkelos is meant. The targum to the prophets is also used, and Rashi finds it far superior to Onkelos. Nevertheless, the influence of the traditional Midrash exegesis with its spiritualized and mystic interpretation was too powerful in France in the eleventh century for Rashi to escape its influence altogether; but his sound judgment and fine tact usually led him to choose the one among the many explanations which came nearest to the literal sense. In many cases, indeed, Rashi expressly requires the haggadic interpretation (e.g., in Gen. i. 1), but sometimes the simple exposition is followed by the most contradictory comments, so that Rashi seems only partly to have attained the high aim he proposed to himself. This is partly due to the minuteness of his exegesis. Moreover, since he clings closely to the literal sense of the words, he is not successful in interpreting continuous passages, neither does he attempt to explain any miracle. Karl Siegfried (in *Archiv für wissenschaftliche Erforschung des A. T 's*, I., 428 sqq., II., 39 sqq.) has shown Rashi's influence over Nicolaus of Lyra and Luther, especially in the exposition of Genesis.

Rashi surpasses all his predecessors as an expositor of the Talmud. With a few well-chosen words he illuminates the obscurity of the often incomprehensible text. The readings he proposed are still authoritative and he is an indispensable aid to those who study the Talmud. Menahem ben Zeraḥ justly remarks in his work *Ẓedah la-Derek* ("Viaticum"; Ferrara, 1554) that without Rashi the Babylonian Talmud would be as much neglected as is the Jerusalem Talmud. The commentary to *Bereshith rabba* ascribed to Rashi is not his work but that of an Italian contemporary. On his death in 1105, he left a flourishing school of disciples who continued his work and brought it to a close, always in his spirit. (A. Wünsche.)

Bibliography: The commentary on the Pentateuch was first printed at Reggio, 1475, then at Soncino, 1487, new critical ed., by A. Berliner, Berlin, 1866; the first ed. of the commentary on the O. T. was Venice, 1525, under the title *Mikraoth Gedholoth*. For full information of editions of the commentary or parts cf. J. Fürst, *Bibliotheca Judaica*, ii. 78 sqq., Leipsic, 1863; cf. *JE*, x. 325–326. The first ed. of the commentary on the Talmud was Venice, 1520–22. On Rashi consult: M. Liber, *Rashi*, Philadelphia, 1906; *JE*, x. 324–328; L. Zunz, in *Zeitschrift für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, 1823, pp. 277–384; J. M. Jost, *Geschichte der Israeliten*, v. 243–248, 375–376, Berlin, 1822; H. Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden*, vi. 64 sqq., Leipsic, 1894; A. Berliner, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Raschi-Kommentare*, Berlin, 1903.

RASKOLNIKS. See Russia, II.

RASLE, rel (RASLES, RALE, RALLE), SÉBASTIEN: French Jesuit missionary to the North American Indians; b. at Dôle (180 m. s.e. of Paris) in 1658; d. at Norridgewock, Me., Aug. 12 (23, new style), 1724. He arrived in Quebec Oct 13, 1689, and after laboring in the Abenaki mission of St. Francis, near the Falls of the Chaudière, seven miles above Quebec, and in the Illinois country, among the Algonquins (1691 or 1692), he returned to the Abenakis (1693 or 1694), and finally settled at Norridgewock on the Kennebec. There he built a chapel (1698), and acquired so much influence among the Abenakis, that he was popularly believed to have incited them to attack the Protestant settlers on the coast. A price was set upon his head. In 1705, 1722, and 1724 Norridgewock was attacked by the settlers, with the result that the first time the chapel was burnt; the second time the rebuilt chapel and Rasle's house were pillaged, and his papers carried off, among them a manuscript dictionary of Abenaki, now in Harvard College library, printed in the *Memoirs of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, ed. with introduction and notes, John Pickering (Cambridge, 1833); and, the third time, he and seven Indians who had undertaken to defend him were killed.

Bibliography: Consult the *Memoir* by C. Francis in J. Sparks, *Library of American Biography*, 25 vols., Boston, 1834–47; the massive *Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents*, ed. R. G. Thwaites, 73 vols., Cleveland, O., 1896–1902; and literature under Jesuits; and Indians of North America, Missions to.

RASMUSSEN, rās-mū'sen, **CHRISTIAN VILHELM:** Danish missionary to Greenland; b. in Skrodsbjärg near Kjöge (28 m. s.w. of Copenhagen), Denmark, Nov. 25, 1846. He was educated at Herlufsholm (B.A., 1865) and Copenhagen (Candidate in Theology, 1872); was missionary in Jakobshavn in the northern part of Greenland (1873–1895), having charge for about fifteen years of the missionary work in the colony of Umanak and oversight of the work in Egedesminde. On his return to Denmark, he was appointed provost of Lynge and Uggelöse (1896); since 1904 he has been lector, giving instruction to the Greenlandic catechists; he also assists the bishops and the minister of state in matters pertaining to church and education in Greenland. Besides translating Balslev's Bible History (first Danish ed., 1844) into Greenlandic, he has written a valuable Greenlandic grammar, *Grönlandsk Sprogläre* (Copenhagen, 1888), and, with J. Kjer, has given philology its first Danish-Greenlandic dictionary, *Dansk-Grönlandsk Ordbog* (1893). In the new Greenlandic Bible, the translation of the books from Joshua to Esther is his work.

John O. Evjen.

RATHERIUS, ra''-ther' î-us: Bishop of Verona; b. near Liége shortly after 887; d. at Namur (36 m. s.e. of Brussels) 974. As a child of five he entered the monastery of Laubach in Hennegau, but

showed the genius of neither a scholar nor a monk. In 926 he accompanied his abbot, Hilduin, to Italy, where the latter's cousin, King Hugo, attracted by the young monk's learning and moral character, promised him the diocese of Verona. His lack of subservience, however, evidently delayed fulfilment of the promise, for it was not until 931, while Ratherius was apparently fatally ill, that Hugo made the formal appointment. Ratherius recovered only to be in strained relations both with the king and with his see; and when, in 935, Arnulf of Bavaria had attacked Verona with the traitorous connivance of Ratherius, and had been repulsed, the bishop was imprisoned at Pavia. Here he composed his *Prœloquia*, moralizing sermons and admonitions to conversion and repentance. In 936 Ratherius was released, but return to Verona was impracticable, and after some three years in the custody of Azo, bishop of Como, he fled to Provence. Sympathy he found in abundance, but no assistance in regaining his diocese; and he was obliged to act as private tutor to a young Provencal, in this capacity writing a grammar (now lost) entitled *Sparadorsum* ("Spare-Back"). This, together with a biography of Ursmar, sometime abbot of Laubach, opened to Ratherius the doors of his old monastery; but it soon became clear that he could no longer be a monk, and, with the encouragement of Hugo, he started to return to Verona. Before he could reach his see city, he was captured by Hugo's enemy, Berengar, but a few weeks later was reinstated in his diocese (946). He was unable, however, to control the see, and two years later was expelled by the king. He now wandered from place to place, vainly seeking assistance and recognition, until he bitterly returned to Laubach, where he addressed three fruitless letters of appeal to Pope Agapetus II., the bishops of Italy, France, and Germany, and all the faithful. In 952 he gladly left Laubach for the royal court of Otto I., where his talents were recognized and his faults obscured by his surroundings. He was soon appointed bishop of Liége, but again he proved his complete unfitness for the episcopate, and, before two years had passed, he was removed from his see. In protest he now composed his *Conclusio deliberativa*, and at Mainz he collected twenty of his letters and other earlier writings in the *Phrenesis*, a protest against his loss of both Verona and Liége. In 955 he became abbot of the little monastery of Alna, a daughter house of Laubach. Here he wrote his *Excerptum ex dialogo confessionali*, in which he advocated the eucharistic teachings of Paschasius Radbertus (see Radbertus, Paschasius). This attitude, however, provoked opposition, and he accordingly defended himself in his *Epistola ad Patricum*, in which he upheld the doctrine of transubstantiation, though without materially advancing the development of the dogma.

At Alna Ratherius still longed for a wider sphere of activity. Liége and Laubach remained closed to him, but in 961 Otto restored him to his see of Verona, where he was soon charged by his clergy with having connived at the robbery of the relics of St. Bruno, his reply, the *Invectiva*, being but a lame defense. The opposition continued, though in his *De contemptu canonum* he endeavored to strengthen his episcopal position. But his courage failed at last, and spiritual distress found expression in his *De proprio lapsu* and *De otioso sermone*. His mistrust and his opponents' hatred alike increased; Ratherius declared the ordinations of his rival, Milo, invalid, and was forced to retract; his cordial reception at the court of the two Ottos at Verona in 967 failed to restore his prestige; and in 968 an imperial tribunal decided against his administration, while the emperor urged him, in the interests of all concerned, to resign his bishopric. In the same year he returned once more to Laubach, only to become involved in disputes with the young abbot of the monastery, who was at last forced from his position. Possessed of considerable wealth accumulated at Verona, Ratherius continued to devise all sorts of simoniacal projects, until, in 974, he died a refugee in the castle of the count of Namur.

Though deeply versed in both sacred and secular learning, Ratherius was a scion of his time in his aversion to original productivity. His writings were invariably publicistic and personal, and form only a commentary on the vicissitudes of his own life. As contrasted with the calm of the Carolingian period, Ratherius felt the doctrines and precepts of the Church to be problematical and subject to criticism. At the same time, he remained loyal, even though he doubted; he was neither a reformer nor a promoter of learning; and only his sharply defined personality renders him perennially interesting. In his *Qualitatis conjectura cujusdam* (written in 965–966) much autobiographical material is contained. The complete works of Ratherius were first collected and edited by Pietro and Girolamo Ballerini (Verona, 1765), and reprinted in *MPL*, cxxxvi. (Friedrich Wiegand.)

Bibliography: Sources are to be found in *MGH, Script.*, iii (1839), 312, 314, iv (1841), 63–65, 69–70, 269–270, vi (1844), 347–349, 352; *MPL*, clx. 574. Consult: A. Vogel, *Ratherius von Verona und das 10. Jahrhundert*, 2 vols., Jena, 1854; *ASM*, sæc. v., pp. 478–487; *Hist. littéraire de la France*, vi. 339–383; A. Ebert, *Allgemeine Geschichte der Litteratur des Mittelalters*, iii. 373–383, Leipsic, 1889; Hauck, *KD*, iii. 285–297; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, xii. 846–860; *KL*, x. 789–791.

RATIONAL: A term used ecclesiastically in three meanings. (1) It is applied to the breastplate worn by the Hebrew high priest according to Ex. xxviii. 15 (see High Priest, 1; and Ephod). (2) It is the name given to an episcopal ecclesiastical vestment worn when celebrating mass. The first traces of its employment are not earlier than the tenth century. In form it was either a small breastshield, or an ornamented narrow band which was worn over the chasuble (see Vestments and Insignia, Ecclesiastical), passing from one shoulder across the back over to the other shoulder and both ends hanging down in front. In the latter case it was the episcopal equivalent of the archiepiscopal pallium, though apparently the employment was restricted to certain bishops (as those of Bamberg, Eichstätt, Lüttich, Minden, and others). In the thirteenth century it seems to have become obsolete in France. (3) The word is used to express an exposition of the significance of divine service, as in the famous work of Durandus (q.v.).

RATIONALISM AND SUPERNATURALISM.

Origin of the Antithesis (§ 1).
Limitation (§ 2).
Two Periods (§ 3).
I. Leibnitz-Wolffian.
Elements of Promotion (§ 1).
Biblical Form (§ 2).
Dogmatic and Eudemonistic (§ 3).
Effect upon Religion (§ 4).
Defense against Rationalism (§ 5).
II. Kantian.
Kant's Critique (§ 1).
Effect upon Theology (§ 2).
Differentiation (§ 3).
Post-Kantian Dogmatic Rationalism (§ 4).
Post-Kantian Biblical Rationalism (§ 5).
Reactionary Supernaturalism (§ 6).
Compromise and Overthrow (§ 7).
III. Critical Review.
IV. Supplemental.
Deistic Rationalism (§ 1).
Anti-Deistic Discussions (§ 2).
Prophetic and Evangelical Defense (§ 3).
Entrance of Scientific Method (§ 4).
Developments 1830–60 (§ 5).
Since 1860 (§ 6).

Rationalism connotes in philosophy the tendency of thought that lays special stress, not on the matter of experience, but on the products of the human reason, whether these consist of innate ideas or a priori concepts. The opposite principle is empiricism, which makes knowledge simply the reproduction of observed facts in their unity. In theology the term rationalism was first applied to criticism of church doctrine as practised by the Socinians and later by the deists. The real point of its application, however, is the stricter, scholastic form of the theological enlightenment which was assumed in Germany in dependence upon the Wolffian and Kantian philosophies. Rationalism unites itself organically with a universal movement of emancipation from ecclesiastical authority, partly in progress beforehand, and partly contemporaneous, in France and England, but assuming its characteristic type from certain philosophical schools and the German formative environment as a whole. Rationalism in theology has in common with rationalism in philosophy the effort to derive the essential in religious knowledge from reason as an original source, instead of regarding it as something received from some other source. This is in the face of a traditional Protestant theology which maintained that God's revelation was absolutely given and that the employment of reason in dealing with it was instrumental and not critical or normative. Human reason was to engage itself with, and apply the accepted good, without addition or subtraction; but was not entitled to subject it to independent proof, to a resultant reduction, or other essential alteration. For in such case, exactly those elements of church belief would be most affected which were not included in universal thought, but rested wholly on divine revelation. In concentrating the defense of the system of church doctrine necessarily upon certain elements of religious truth held to be supernatural and superrational, there resulted for the opponents of the rationalistic criticism the name of supernaturalists. The first mention of the term that may be traced is in *Sokratischen Unterhaltungen über das Aelteste und Neueste aus der christlichen Welt* (1789).

1. Origin of the Antithesis.

The antithesis between the two involves the source, mediation, and appropriation of the knowledge of Christian truth. Supernaturalism bases Christianity upon an immediate and positive revelation of God. This consists of doctrines to be proclaimed for human salvation which are unattainable by reason of itself; they must be authenticated by miracles and prophecies, and handed down by divinely originated Scriptures. This revelation demands an unconditional recognition of its authority. Rationalism, on the contrary, is convinced that man is pointed also, in satisfying his longing for God, to the use of the reason, which, if rightly employed, affords the knowledge of God in his omnipotent creation, merciful preservation, and just dispensation of reward and punishment. For man's moral nature and happiness no direct divine instruction beyond this is desirable. Miracles and prophecies are not conclusive; for moderate rationalism may exercise a certain measure of indulgence toward what is offered by church tradition, or may even appropriate the same, if this is possible in accordance with its own criteria; but strict rationalism acknowledges no religious knowledge except what is begotten of reason. The question is one of authority: supernaturalism adheres to revelation, rationalism to reason, to determine the content and limit of religious truth. A point in common, however, is the intellectualistic conception of the content of religion. Supernaturalism however does not sound the entire Biblical and Reformation depth and fulness of Christian faith, for instead of unfolding the equation, as given in faith, of the person, free or bound, to the vital movement of revelation, out of the nature of the case, it labors under the burden of establishing the plausibility of an authoritative doctrine. While rationalism represents a one-sided yet clear and simple principle, supernaturalism scarcely escapes the contradiction of submitting its content as teachable doctrine and yet withholding it from the test of reason. Kant pointed out that rationalism and supernaturalism are not mutually exclusive. After his view, a rationalist may be one who holds only a natural religion as morally necessary; a supernaturalist, one who holds belief in a supernatural divine revelation for a universal religion to be necessary. A critical rationalism does not involve necessarily the denial of the reality of all supernatural revelation; such should rather be termed naturalism. Rationalism as such does not dispute the truth and value of revelation *per se*, but only its claim to absolute authority; while supernaturalism does not contest the competence of the reason absolutely in matters of the religious life, only its right of preestablishing religious truth from itself. While at both extremes, the contradiction was held to be irreconcilable, yet this was more the result of an emphasis of feeling than intellectual discrimination of difference. In order to save its foothold in the Church rationalism knew how to com-

2. Limitation.

promise with the assumption of a special revelation accessible to reason, while supernaturalism made far-reaching concessions. Combined types were frequent and were even held to offer the only solution. To deduce the issue of the antithesis as necessary from Protestantism is superfluous, since neither the proof of rationalism nor the method of defense on the part of supernaturalism had then taken definite shape; although it is true that Protestantism consents to, and continually requires proof of, the traditional state of doctrine, without, however, being separable from a historical revelation of redemption.

Before proceeding to outline the history of the movement, it is well to define the limits of the periods of rationalism. While most Protestants place the beginning at the middle of the eighteenth century, G. Frank dates its principle from the birth of the critical philosophy, designating the corresponding movement before Kant as neology. Doubtless Kant, by his theory of knowledge and his moral and religious doctrine, gave the movement of the controversy a new turn and impetus; but it may be questioned whether the difference from the previous efforts of the same kind is sufficient to warrant the distinction of the latter by another term. A common possession of German theology was the method of demonstration of Wolff replacing the traditional ideas with the rational thoughts of universe, God, and man, and the optimistically colored cosmic theory of Leibnitz; and although not concentrated into definite schools as after the time of Kant, yet it was less discursive and unsystematic than Deism (q.v.) This appearance at the middle of the eighteenth century may be taken as the beginning. The second period inaugurated by Kant may be called the critical one in the sense of a closer definition of his position and a sharper accentuation of the question as to the authority of revelation or the autonomy of reason. This period may be characterized as practico-moral, anti-metaphysical, and anti-eudemonistic. The idealistic philosophy of Hegel and his followers is genuinely rationalistic; yet, in comparison with earlier forms it may be included only in a very qualified sense. Hence, there stand forth the two periods indicated, and the movement may be said to have terminated when a more vital view of religion and a more unbiased historical sense crowded the former situation of the problem from scientific theology. From the nature of the antagonism the periods of supernaturalism are the same.

3. Two Periods.

I. Leibnitz-Wolffian: Rationalism comprehends in its origin and extension various theological, philosophical, ecclesiastical, and social movements. An important condition of its forthcoming was (1) the decreasing vitality of orthodox theological scholasticism. Even recourse to the authority of Scripture could not stay the decadence, for the discrepancy between dogma and Scripture became more and more apparent. Then came (2) Pietism with its inward devoutness. To be sure, being non-critical, it domiciled itself in the accepted dogma; yet its indirect effects resulted in the rebound from the fruitlessness of speculation and the preparation of a tremendous subjective groundswell. To release this required only a shattering of the external authority. This was done by (3) the philosophy of Christian Wolff (q.v.). It found no contradiction between reason and revelation. Their spheres are so contiguous that the line of separation is all but effaced. Reason also leads to an absolute being and is capable of a series of intelligible recognitions of it that claim the advantage of being demonstrable. A rational theology arises, which indeed does not comprehend all the knowledge of the divine, but is of greater apologetic serviceableness by virtue of its intellectual derivation. The content of revelation transcends but does not contradict reason. The supernatural afforded by revelation is fundamentally akin to that of reason, and together they form an unbroken series. While the sacrifice of the doctrine of sinful corruption might arouse suspicion among the Pietists (as the school at Halle); on the other hand, by virtue of its demonstrative method, and by integrating theology with intellectual interests as a whole, it won popularity elsewhere, notably after 1730. The movement enthroned the rational element in thought and stimulated confidence in thinking for oneself and in the conviction that the Enlightenment (q.v.) offered the solution of progress. This (4) was reinforced by the influence of the deistic literature of England and France (see DEISM). This was translated and the deistic arguments against the necessity of a special revelation, against the exclusive truth of Christianity, and against the inspiration and credibility of the Bible, gained wide acceptance. (In Germany, moreover, the acceptance of the teachings of Leibnitz and Wolff obstructed a more comprehensive influence of the thought of Spinoza.) A German deistic literature also arose. H. S. Reimarus (q.v.; see WOLFENBUETTEL FRAGMENTS) in *Schutzschrift für die vernünftigen Verehrer Gottes*, a work brought out posthumously by Lessing, opposes, critically, to a revealed, a natural religion. He deems it unthinkable that God reserved his knowledge for the small Jewish people and for a Christianity forming only a minority of the human race. He opposes the account of miracle with the advanced knowledge of nature; and the ethical views of individual Old-Testament narrators, with the requirements of an enlightened morality; and he calls for the renunciation of supernatural revelation in order to rescue more securely natural religion and ethics. A final factor in promoting rationalism (5) was the changed intellectual spirit and literary taste; not so much in respect of the natural sciences as of the development of a doctrine of State and law, away from theocratic notions, basing the civilization of human society upon natural interests and reasonable objects, and demanding, with reference to religion, a broad toleration. This development would affect also the concept of the Church; it would strip away the garb of a divine ordinance, and put in its place either subordination to the general ideal of the State, or voluntary human association.

1. Elements of Promotion.

The real history of pre-Kantian rationalism is usually opened with J. S. Semler (q.v.). Trained in

Pietism and in the philosophy of Wolff, he demanded critical analysis with tradition; moved dogma into the light of historical elucidation, and measured it by the standard of its moral utility, and specially championed a liberal independence of piety from dogmatic fetters. However, he served rather to sound the key-note than to offer the program. J. A. Ernesti (q.v.), conservative in dogmatics and Wolffian supernaturalist in his view of revelation, demanded a grammatical exegesis to the exclusion of all matter foreign to the text. Real rationalism reached its climax in the third generation of this school in K. A. G. Keil (q.v.) and others. More considerate to orthodoxy is J. D. Michaelis (q.v., 3), who employed his inclination to rationalistic interpretation only where no direct dogmatic interest was at stake. The triumphantly advancing historical treatment of Scripture crystallized itself by the formation of the literary method in Biblical introduction (J. G. Eichhorn; q.v.) and in New-Testament textual criticism (J. J. Griesbach; q.v.). Their most significant fruit was the founding of Biblical theology which not only transformed the Scriptural proof of dogma but sought to create a secure foundation for the efforts put forth for the Biblical reduction of dogma. Its beginnings (A. F. Buesching; G. T. Zachariae; q.v.) assume the character of a censorship of church doctrine; the originator of its scientific program, J. P. Gabler (q.v.; *De justo discrimine theologcæ biblicæ et dogmaticæ*, 1787), and his followers belong to rationalism. With W M. L. de Wette (q.v.) Biblical theology first enters upon a more historical method. In the field of dogmatics, it was not so easy to break away from tradition shielded within symbols. A transition method arose characterized by a moderation of the boldest extravagances and by proposing a simple mode of teaching as an alternative for the traditional. Important for the history of dogmatics is J. F. Töllner (q.v.) thoroughly Wolffian in system, but exercising a keen criticism on the single point of Christ's obedience. J. F. Gruner (d. 1778) carried this criticism to a farther extent; recognized in all Christian dogma perverting Platonic and Aristotelian influences; and committed himself to the progress of theology, historical-grammatical interpretation, and the ample use of the reason. A further step in the adaptation of dogmatic material to the rationalizing process was the substitution by theologians of the principle of happiness for the supernatural plan of redemption (eudemonism). As soon as men were convinced that religious knowledge was to a great extent accessible to the reason and that rational knowledge was only unessentially complemented by revelation, the next step was to determine the result upon human life. But by reason was understood not so much an ideal principle as the usual sound common sense, which has its function in the promotion of human happiness. Eudemonism became the material principle in dogmatics, corresponding to the formal principle of rationalism. The preacher no longer sought to prompt the people to a higher idealism, but complacently descended to the discussion of practical interests, such as the benefit of vaccination, of stall-feeding, or how to obtain a quiet sleep; although it is to be said that there was no lack of celebrated pulpit speakers. The corresponding pedagogical theory is philanthropy which aims to advance human happiness along the line of natural development. This was frequently combined with theological rationalism in the persons of its representatives.

2. Biblical Form.

3. Dogmatic and Eudemonistic.

A transcript of the average rationalistic dogmatics of the period is not out of place. Religion was essentially a matter of the reason. Its essence was to guide a man to a reasonable and therefore moral, happy life. Revelation was a supernatural form of instruction which missed its object when it retained mysteries. It must prove itself an expansion of natural knowledge, subject to the criteria of reason. To some, Christianity was the embodiment of reasonable religion, of course in its Biblical simplicity, not in its dogmatic form. Yet this was subject to further reduction, mostly on the principle of expelling individual, local, or temporal admixtures, or on the assumption of the theory that the writer was accommodating his production to the limited intelligence of his contemporaries. Others held the theory of the potential perfectibility of Christianity (Semler, W. A. Teller, Lessing). This position exhibited a greater measure of historical appreciation than the average rationalism. It thought to derive the picture of Christianity from the sources, employing the representation of the religion of reason as the critical norm. The Old Testament was considered within its time and environment and the Jewish religion was the main source of the elements of the New Testament, which were taken to be less in accordance with reason. The doctrine of Scriptural inspiration was reduced by accepting only the historical material or limiting its function to the place of an auxiliary of the divine Spirit. Miracles were explained by natural causes, by the aid of thunder and lightning, or assuming for the men involved in the miraeles knowledge of physics, chemistry, or even pyrotechnics. The principle of parsimony as to miracles offered by J. D. Michaelis gained wide acceptance. Original sin was specially attacked; its guilt was denied, and it was presumed to be merely a limitation of nature (Töllner), a physical corruption to be illustrated, for instance, by the eating of a poisonous fruit (Michaelis). To man was ascribed a capacity to fulfil his moral duties, and all that was left to grace was the function of supporting and acknowledging human virtue. Predestination was indignantly repudiated or identified with justification (E. J. Danovius; q.v.). In Christology the doctrine of the two natures was replaced by the assumption of an extraordinary inspiration, on the part of conservatives (C. W. F. Walch; q.v.); rationalists as such maintained a more or less unconditioned moral preeminence of Jesus. On the doctrine of the atonement Ernesti considered the threefold office of Christ a dissection of the simple Biblical view. Töllner disputed the active obedience. Conservative dogmaticians rested on an Arminian theory, while radicals re-

4. Effect upon Religion.

jected all thought of satisfaction and forgiveness as impossible. The salvation of heathen who work righteousness was conceded. On the doctrine of justification the view of Trent was approximated; on the sacraments, that of the Reformed. In eschatology, only the ideas of immortality and retribution remained.

The defense against rationalism for this period was not concentrated, and sums itself up (1) in such advocates of traditional orthodoxy as the unconditional authority for the Church as

5. Defense against Rationalism.

J. B. Carpzov (q.v.) and C. F Sartorius (d. 1785); (2) the supernaturalists of the Wolffian school reconstructed dogma by the use of concessions of this school to revelation, of whom were Jacob Carpov (d. 1768) and S. J. Baumgarten (q.v.); but this compromise position could not long be maintained successfully; (3) the supernaturalism founded by J. A. Bengel (q.v.) sprang from a piety more in keeping with Scripture than the symbolic form of doctrine and bore a scholarly impress; yet his school opposed critical investigation of the Scriptures, and their certainty of the systematic unity of the Biblical body of thought led to the rejection of philosophical admixture. Foremost among these, C. A. Crusius (q.v.) opposed the Leibnitz-Wolffian determinism, optimism, and spiritualism, and unfolded in his "prophetic theology" an integral plan for the history of the divine kingdom. There was (4) a group of apologists who defended the challenged points of Christian religion and philosophy against deism after the fashion of the English anti-deistic apologetic (Gottfried Less, J. G. Rosenmueller; qq.v). C. Bonnet advanced a defense of miracles as preordained modifications of the laws of nature. A noteworthy support was found by these theological efforts of a counter-rationalism in the tendency of the literature of the time toward increased spiritual depth. Already Lessing suffered just acknowledgment to pass upon the intellectual effort in church doctrine, confronted the profundity of the doctrine of the Trinity with a speculative interest, and for the civilization of the human race he provided a scheme in which also historical revelation may find an estimable valuation. Justus Moeser (d. 1794) defended positive religion against the abstractions of the representatives of the Enlightenment and philosophers, especially J. J. Rousseau (q.v.). J. G. Herder (q.v.) imparted to a wide circle the impression of the poetical beauty, power, and rich suggestive depth of Scripture.

II. Kantian: Kant's critical philosophy recasts the antithesis of rationalism and supernaturalism and invests it with new relationships. The authorities upon which both the criticism

1. Kant's Critique.

and the apology of dogma had relied were overthrown. Natural theology in the meaning of Wolff and the popular philosophy disappears. Before the throne of the pure theoretic reason dogmatic theism and dogmatic atheism are alike dismissed. The idea of God survives as a mere ideal or problematical concept. The moral law alone lifts man above the world of phenomena to the dignity of a rational autonomous being, conscious also of the intelligible order of his environment. In moral conduct rational concepts become practical; freedom is the necessary presupposition of self-determination; immortality is postulated for the perfect attainment of the moral ideal; and the idea of God, for the unity of the phenomenal and ethical worlds. Religion can be based on morality alone. The converse would be fatal to both; it would rob the moral of its autonomy, and religion of its content and purity. Positive religion is, however, not the offspring of pure ethics. Bound up with historical phenomena, it set in motion certain moral basic ideas. It is therefore fitting to develop the historical religion into the pure religion of reason. The religion founded by Christ approximates the religion of reason as closely as is possible for an ecclesiastical faith. Stripped of their historical envelopment the doctrines of sin, satisfaction, regeneration, righteousness, afford ideas fit for every ethical faith. Revelation may thus be said to have pointed out to reason the course which it is compelled to pursue by its own inner laws. If this, however, be granted, revelation loses its further importance. Miracles may be dispensed with, since the religion of reason requires no authentication that addresses the senses. Its historical mediators make room for the ideal truth which they hitherto witnessed, which every man may now find in himself. Revealed religion is materially identical with natural, i.e., pure moral religion. Ecclesiastical faith can serve only as the vehicle of pure religion (moral) and it follows that Scripture must be explained in the light of the latter, no matter how forced this has been.

By this revolution the previous course of rational theology stood fundamentally condemned: its optimism was accused of being shallow; its eudemonism was declared unmoral; and its ratiocination was

2. Effect upon Theology.

rejected as presumptuous. The net result, however, is a new rational directive force. A moral interpretation is forced upon Scripture; the historical is considered inconsequent; and revelation is discarded after fulfilling its service. The essential substance of Christianity is to undergo a change. Redemption must give place to an ideal philosophy leaning upon the moral law. The order from grace is transposed. A new and more subtle rationalism could thus follow in Kant's footsteps turning the thought of rational freedom, which had a just ground against cosmic law, against religion itself. An interesting commentary on Kant's religious doctrine may be found in the earliest work of J. G. Fichte (q.v.), "Critique of all Revelation" (1792), which represents moral conduct alone as unconditionally necessary, while religion is conditionally necessary only where the moral law falls short of determining, for its own sake, the human will. Revealed religion is then justified only when the efficacy of the moral law is so impeded that it requires sensible supernatural acts to restore it to power, in that it reinforces the authority of the moral law by the authority of God. Such a revelation can not be regarded as impossible, since the natural order is subordinate to the moral.

Kant's statements on the relation of Christianity to the religion of reason lent themselves to the support of two opposite views: that historic Christianity has brought into reality the pure religion of reason; or, that the pure religion of reason makes all revelation dispensable. These gave rise to two theological tendencies, both capable of being unified with Kant's critical deductions, inasmuch as he neither unconditionally affirmed nor denied the claims of Christianity to revelation. The one allowed the character of Christianity as revelation to stand, but employed the principle of the reason for its justification and critical simplification; the other took reason as the unconditional critical norm and the adequate source of religious truth as well. The first may be termed critical supernaturalism, while the second beginning with critical rationalism gradually passes over into dogmatic rationalism. The critical supernaturalists, a small group, preferred to accept the synoptic teachings of Jesus as the picture of real Christianity. Foremost of these was J. H. Tieftrunk (q.v.) who interpreted Christian revelation according to moral postulates without, however, resolving it into mere moral truths. Especially does he aim to preserve the position of redemption as presupposed to Christian ethics. By representing the moral ideal in his person, Christ makes possible the realization of the final purpose of the world and he is the foundation of grace without which a happy observance of the moral law is impossible (cf. A. Ritschl). Akin to this K. L. Nitzsch (q.v.) professed the supernatural form of Christianity, treating its content, however, ethically, not in accordance with the empirical but the pure reason. Along the other tendency, critical rationalism first undertook the criticism of traditional religious truth. In the spirit of Lessing and Semler, it sought to ascertain the simple original forms as appearing in the example and proclamation of Jesus. But the other view pushed more and more to the front, that reason was the productive source of religious truth. Thereby natural revelation, which was still retained, was made a mere name for a content of knowledge at all times accessible to the human reason. The chief representative of critical rationalism was H. P. K. Henke (q.v.) who essayed to combat superstition in its threefold form of Christolatry, bibliolatry, and onomatolatry (or dependence on an antiquated terminology and form of doctrine). For him Christian dogmatics had been too discursive in Messianic doctrine, impertinent suppositions of the New-Testament writers, and Platonic representations. In fact only a simple matter is involved; to bring Christ's example and teaching into effect. The proof of the divine origin of this doctrine asserts itself by its correspondence with the principles of reason and by the experience of its inherent truth and excellence. Thus critical simplification serves the necessary course of all religious revelation, to lead revealed religion gradually over into the rational. A similar point of view of starting out with religious faith from the practical reason is taken by J. C. R. Eckermann (d. 1837), with, however, a solicitous concern for "popular religion." He doubts if this can dispense with divinely sent bearers of revelation. In the person of Christ he would admit a mystery, namely, his union with God, never quite to be established.

3. Differentiation.

Completely dogmatic is the rationalism of J. A. L. Wegscheider (q.v.), who maintained that the progress of history, the knowledge of nature, and philosophy had overtaken supernaturalism. Reason can admit only a natural revelation, such as is manifest in the ordinary course of the world and its action upon human knowledge. He would insist strenuously upon the distinction of rationalism and naturalism, inasmuch as the latter denied all revelation, even the natural. Belief in a supernatural revelation concerns an age of inferior civilization, when, without premonition of the real range of the human intellect, the spontaneous perceptions of truth were misapprehended as divinely wrought. Later such belief proved itself useful in a political and moral way. From this, however, the absolute necessity for such a revelation does not follow. Reason in this sense is evidently not the critical organ in the sense of Kant, who finds the open way to religion only through the moral law; it is thoroughly dogmatic. Beside the moral argument for the existence of God are set up the cosmological, physico-theological, and even the ontological arguments. Moral debility takes the place of radical sin. Christ is the herald of reason and the wholly inspired prototype of man. A labored effort is made to shelter a compromised notion of the concept of forgiveness. Others reject this as morally impossible and not to be represented in the Church (J. F. C. Loeffler; d. 1816). This type of rationalism degenerated to the common or popular type. Its classical memorial is J. F Roehr's (q.v.) *Briefe über den Rationalismus* (1813) in which he argues Christianity as the universal religion on the basis of its self-evidence and reasonableness for common human sense and excludes Christology from the religious system.

4. Post-Kantian Dogmatic Rationalism.

More harsh than in dogmatics appeared the forced and unhistorical rationalistic interpretation of Christianity in exegesis. To the necessity imposed by Kant upon interpretation, of finding the fixed a priori moral truths in Scripture, was now added the object of bringing it into harmony with a clarified view of nature. Thus the narratives of miracle were brought into the light of natural occurrences, for which in addition to the already available means of electricity also magnetic powers were pressed into service. The didactic content was submitted to the accommodation hypothesis. With the assumption that Jesus and his apostles, to facilitate their access, conformed to Jewish representations and the general opinions of the day, it was presumed to distinguish between kernel and husk *ad libitum*. This was, in fact, nothing else than attributing one's own theory of revelation, as the introducing medium of the truth of pure reason, to the supposed consciousness of the bearers of revelation themselves. Old-Testament exegetes of this order were

5. Post-Kantian Biblical Rationalism.

K. D. Ilgen (d. 1834), W. F. Hufnagel (d. 1830), and H. F. W Gesenius (q.v.); and in the New Testament, H. E. G. Paulus (q.v.). The influence of this exegesis upon the Evangelical view of history shows itself best in the *Leben Jesu* of D. F. Strauss (q.v.). Pauline theology had to undergo ethical correction in order to convert faith into fidelity to convietion and justifieation into spiritual integrity (Paulus). Individual rationalists began to employ mythical explanations (Wegscheider; J. P Gabler; q.v.). In this seeond period also rationalism was popularized from pulpit and books of instruction.

6. Reactionary Supernaturalism.

While rationalism prevailed in theological faculties and in learned literature, there were praetical religious spirits that devoted themselves to the culture of a strict Biblical Christianity; and there was no total laek of intelleetual efforts to defend Biblieal revelation and its supernatural charaeter. Such a revelation was aceepted by the eritieal supernaturalism relating itself to Kant; only, however, dependent upon subsequent verifieation in aeeordance with reason. Standing out more boldly was a Biblieal supernaturalism in league with the Bengel school, advaneing the authority of revelation. It proposed to establish the eredibility of Scripture as a formal defense for its positive religious eontent. The result was a mixture of rational and authoritative judgments, whereas in proceeding to the verification of the content of religious truth only the latter would prevail. The best-known representative of this tendency was G. C. Storr (d. 1805), founder of the older Tübingen School (q.v.). In his *Theologiæ Christianæ* (1807) historieal proof is advanced for the first time that there are reliable accounts of Jesus in the New Testament. But Jesus himself authenticated his teaching by the claim of divine origin, and he vouehed for this by his moral eharaeter and miraeles. Upon his diseiples he eonferred the continuation of the offiee of teaching and promised them the enlightenment of the Holy Spirit. Paul has the same rank by his own witness and that of other apostles. Consequently, the New-Testament writings possess divine authority. As the New Testament witnesses to the content and canonical estimation of the Old, the entire Bible must be regarded as a book of divine authority, whose requirements are eommands of God, and its precepts and aecounts are true. After the leap from the human trustworthiness of Biblieal authors to the divine truthfulness of the content of Seripture has been made, dogmatic theology is transformed into Biblical, in which dogmatie interests ever voice themselves. In inereasing measure, to the formal supernaturalism of this school is yoked a practical moralism adapted from Kant (E. G. Bengel; d. 1826). A less eentralized group was formed by the representatives of supernaturalism outside of the Swabian group. F V Reinhard (q.v.) discovered in loyalty to Seripture an escape from philosophieal skeptieism, though his uneertain dogmaties and his vague ethies formed an unwilling tribute to the *Zeitgeist*. A clarion call for the rallying of supernaturalism was made by Claus Harms (q.v.) in his ninety-five theses at the third centennial anniversary of the Reformation (1817). August Hahn (q.v.) in his *De rationalismi vera indole* (1827) called attention to the unreserved naturalistic character of rationalism, whose devotees he read out of the Chureh. The only form of this period that attained to permanency was the Biblical supernaturalism. This is readily understood in part when it is remembered that there was no philosophical system upon which a theology, passing beyond Kant's moral theory, could venture as upon a foundation. The religious philosophy of F. H. Jacobi (d. 1819) indeed assured the right of religious conviction beside rational cosmic perception, but in basing itself upon an immediate divine revelation through a rational feeling it offered no more room for objective historical revelation than Kant's moral idealism itself.

7. Compromise and Overthrow.

Soon after the beginning of the nineteenth century attempts were made to harmonize the antithesis of rationalism and supernaturalism, which resulted in the mixed forms of supernatural rationalism and rational supernaturalism, depending upon the change of emphasis. According to K. G. Bretschneider (q.v.), the former is a historieal authentieation of the pure religion of reason, and therefore concedes to revelation no influence upon the religious content; and the latter concedes to revelation a supplementation of rational knowledge, in so far as this is non-contradietory. These compounds in name merely serve as a sign of the dissolution of the antithesis. The progress of theology did not advanee from these compromises. The problem was shifted to other ground as soon as it became apparent that the intellectualistic formulation of religion and consequently of revelation was irrelevant. Rationalists and their opponents alike had taken for granted that religion originates from the aeceptance of a certain sum of prescriptions and doctrines, and under this presupposition, it was a simple alternative whether this body of dogma or theology was natural or revealed. With the collapse of such a foundation, the controversy built thereon, if not entirely void, must at least assume another form. If religion, however, was a peculiar function of the personal life of the spirit essentially different from metaphysics and ethies, then the way was open to see revelation in a freer, more immediate, and personal character. With F. Schleiermacher's (q.v.) *Reden* (1799) a new view-point was entered which wielded a more comprehensive influence with the appearance of his *Der christliche Glaube* (1821). With the functions of eognition and practical activity there coordinated itself the realization in feeling of the immediate union of man and God. The revelation on which this union subsisted was not required to be in the form of final doetrine whether natural or supernatural in origin. Guided by the inwardly experienced attracting power of the divine, it was able to appropriate from reality immediately immanent, or accessible by way of history. Thus, the doctrinaire point of view held by rationalism and supernaturalism in common was overthrown. This departure was accelerated by the simultaneous appearance of

Romanticism which took in hand the cause of the immediate and original and shunned mere rational analysis as a limitation. It is doubtful, however, if Schleiermacher's theory of religion would single-handed have produced a basic reform in theological method had it not been paralleled by another reaction, which he represented only in part, namely, the awakening of the historical sense, bringing to light the treasures of the past, and throwing into a more modest balance the materials of the present. The more dogmatic rationalism had lately come into being, and the more emphatically it asserted the momentary perception of knowledge for the reason the more precarious became its insight into the historical contingency of its rational materials that from now on rose to the surface. As for dogmatic supernaturalism, historical research tore away the shield of formal Scriptural authority, compelling it to seek revelation in the course of history, and to recognize its criteria not in outer authenticity, but in its vital intrinsic operation. A final factor to overshadow rationalism in its vague and speculative methods was the development of post-Kantian ideal philosophy with its larger standards of thought and more comprehensive problems (see IDEALISM, II.). Individual combats that mark its steps of decline must be taken as mere episodes. Rationalism was expelled from thought by an altered tendency of the intellectual and spiritual life; and with it, for want of a point of resistance, departed supernaturalism in the historic sense.

III. Critical Review: Turning from the historical to the elementary antithesis between the authoritative and critical conceptions of Christianity, it may be admitted that this has always existed fundamentally in varying forms and continues till now. To Hegel and his speculative school their antagonists opposed the historical. In turn followed the critical method subjecting the accredited facts of historical revelation to the canon of its principles of critical investigation and depriving it of its supernatural form. The more the critical, rational view applied the principle of historical analogy, recognizing that as true and essential which recurs in all religions, the more apologetics was forced upon the rallying-ground of emphasizing the uniqueness and incomparableness of Christianity and to base its absoluteness thereon. However, this further development is not expressible in the terms of the former antithesis. The category of reason as the immanent standard has been replaced by that of the necessary and universal conformity to law; and that of the supernatural, by emphasis upon the newness and originality of the content of life as manifest in history and incorporate in personality. And it is clearly understood that in these not historical investigation as such but faith realizes the divine revelation. As to their comparative value, it may be said that the authoritative and the critical, rational elements in Christian faith are always inseparably united. Faith is conscious of being determined by a creative, authoritative power, and can not come to a positive affirmation of its right and truth without critical proof of its content. Hence, a comparison of this content with the materials of the actual spiritual life—that is, a rational digestion—is always requisite. The one-sided advance of either will always call forth a reaction from the other. Unauthorized and barren is the pretense of either to be the whole truth and thus to prevent the vital synthesis of both elements agreeable to faith. The historical course of evolution has made this clear. Whenever dogmatic rationalism arrogated to itself a monopoly of truth, without need of revelation, it became sterile for theological regeneration. Likewise, whenever supernaturalism denied to reason the examination of its content and proclaimed the historical proof of authority as sufficient, it lost contact with vital religious thinking, because it could no longer show how revealed truth may become personal conviction. Rationalism has pushed the inner unity of revelation with the practical moral states of human soul-life into a clearer light. Especially did the Kantian form not only recognize with an honest enthusiasm the moral magnitude of Jesus and his Gospel, but it brought them to the light of understanding in memorable characters. Supernaturalism, however, gave witness, against the naked intelligibility and superficial self-complacency of the age, to the renewing and liberating power of the historically determined Christian revelation, and preserved the use of its sources. (O. KIRN.)

IV. Supplemental: The foundation of rationalism in English thought was laid in the scientific spirit introduced by Bacon and Newton, in philosophy by the Cambridge Platonists (q.v.) by reference to immutable and eternal truth, in theology by Samuel Clarke (q.v.) in his ontological demonstration of the being and attributes of God. As a distinctive phenomenon, however, rationalism began with the deistic movement (see DEISM), and was introduced by Lord Herbert of Cherbury (d. 1648) who was satisfied with a religion embracing the existence of God, to be worshiped by virtue and piety, moral sanction operating both here and hereafter, and with the expiation of sin by penitence. Redemptive is thus ignored in favor of natural religion as universally valid. Thomas Hobbes (q.v.) maintained a dual attitude, allowing to the State sovereign authority over its subjects in matters of traditional religious opinion, which after all may be only superstition, yet reserving an esoteric right of private judgment for the enlightened thinker. John Locke (q.v.) was, however, the philosopher through whom came definite emancipation for rational inquiry. Whereas Robert Boyle and Pascal (qq.v.) had differently estimated the claims of reason and faith, Locke adjusted the conflict by subjecting faith to reason. Faith might accept a supernatural revelation, yet reason must judge both the credentials and the contents of the same (*Essay concerning Human Understanding*, "Reason and Faith").

1. Deistic Rationalism.

Rationalism was thus well established as a method of ascertaining truth, a result to which Locke by his essential idealism and his theory of knowledge had made an important contribution. Besides, reason had thrown off the yoke of Roman Catholic authority. The principle of the Reformation was bearing fruit in subjective certainty based on the right of private

judgment. Toleration, even if only partial, had opened the door to wider liberty of utterance, in which one discovers the effect of Milton's great plea in *Areopagitica*, Chillingworth's *Religion of Protestants*, Jeremy Taylor's *Liberty of Prophecying*, and Locke's *Letters on Toleration*. Profound governmental changes had compelled men to find rational ground for their political convictions. Literary and historical criticism of the Bible was establishing positions contrary to traditional beliefs. Calvinists and Arminians were arrayed against each other, ostensibly sheltering themselves behind Scriptural proofs, but really fortifying their tenets with philosophy, psychology, and metaphysics. John Toland (q.v.) in his *Christianity not Mysterious* recognized no revelation which is not wholly luminous to the human intelligence. Anthony Collins (q.v.) in his *Discourse of Free Thinking* advocated the untrammeled use of the understanding in all religious questions; and he (*A Discourse on the Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion*) and Thomas Woolston (q.v.; *Discourses on the Miracles of our Saviour*) respectively eliminate the two chief credentials of revelation—prophecy and miracle. Matthew Tindal (q.v.) in *Christianity as Old as the Creation* reduces revelation to reason, its content the law or light of nature or natural religion as practised by all peoples, additions to which, such as are presupposed in supernatural revelation, would be either superfluous, unintelligible, or false. Shaftesbury (d. 1713; *Characteristics*) and Thomas Chubb (q.v.; *Posthumous Tracts*) carried on a sharp polemic against the morality of the New Testament, and Thomas Morgan (q.v.; *The Moral Philosopher*) against that of the Old Testament.

2. Anti-Deistic Discussions.

The deistic writers called out a series of replies in defense of the traditional beliefs of the Church. Charles Leslie (q.v.; *Short and Easy Method with the Deists*) laid down four tests to prove the truth of Christianity. Richard Bentley (q.v.), the sharpest critic of the time, pulverized Tindal's claims to scholarship in the Scriptures and in the classics (*Remarks by Phileleutherus Lipsiensis*). John Norris (d. 1711; *Account of Reason and Truth in Relation to the Mysteries of Christianity*, London, 1697) found a basis for revelation in the scholastic distinction between things above and contrary to the reason. Peter Brown (d. 1735; *Procedure, Extent and Limits of Human Understanding*, and *Things Supernatural and Divine Conceived by Analogy with Things Natural and Human*) maintained the utter disparity between human and divine goodness—a position carried still farther by William Law (q.v.; *Works*, vol. ii., "The Case of Reason"), that revelation is to be received not from human judgment of its excellence but because God has declared it to be such; reason is thus our capacity to be instructed. John Conybeare (q.v.; *A Defence of Revealed Religion*) held that there may be distinctions in the divine nature and qualities of divine action of which one can be sure only by revelation, which is not from a human but from a divine source. Daniel Waterland (q.v.; *Scripture Vindicated*), the most learned writer in defense of the supernatural, in reply to aspersions upon the morality of the Old-Testament actions, whether those of God or of his servants, contended that the sole question is not what we a priori think should have been done, but only what was actually done, which carries its sufficient vindication. William Warburton (q.v.; *The Divine Legation of Moses*) held that the absence of belief in a future life among the Hebrews, contrary to all other nations and to rational expectation, is accounted for on the ground that God substitutes immediate providential rewards and punishments to the chosen people in the present life—a proof of miraculous intervention. This group of writers must be supplemented by Bishop Butler (q.v.; *The Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed, to the Constitution and Course of Nature*). Although Butler's work is a reply to Tindal and brought the deistic movement to an end, yet its method is essentially rationalistic, save where he betrays a thorough-going distrust of the reason. With the deists he accepts the doctrine of God, a providential order, and a future life of rewards and punishments grounded in reason, and, on the basis of probability, derived from reason and experience, establishes a prejudice favorable to Christianity as a supernatural religion confirmed by external evidences. The argument is purely rational in form, with little reliance on facts drawn from the redemptive order. The discussions of Hume (q.v.; *Essay on Miracles*, *Dialogues concerning Natural Religion*, and *Natural History of Religion*) were directed equally against the traditional belief, on the one hand, and, on the other, against the deistic positions. In his argument concerning miracles, ignoring the piecemeal method of Woolston, he attacks the trustworthiness of all testimony which would validate so-called exceptions to universal experience or violations of the natural order. On the question of theism, he recognizes no ultimate cause which surpasses the actual effects experienced in the world; all effects must be matched by equal causes. There is no permanent essential necessity for the existence of a Supreme Being; the ground of the natural world may be in itself. The perfect cause which is required to adjust the inequalities of the present can not be inferred from the existing imperfect conditions. Finally, the natural history of religion discloses the illusory character alike of its beginning and of its ultimate conclusions.

3. Prophetic and Evangelical Defense.

The numerous replies to the attack on prophecy limited prophecy to prediction, treated the Old-Testament passages in relation to those of the New as if the writers described the future with equal facility and detail as the past, and in an arbitrary, uncritical, unhistorical manner found the facts and truths of the New Testament in the Old (cf. E. Chandler, *A Defence of Christianity;* T. Newton, *Dissertations on Prophecy*). The attack on miracles was met by the assumption that miracles are not impossible, and that testimony for them comes from reliable witnesses who suffered in behalf of their reports (cf. T. Sherlock, *Trial of the Witnesses*, London, 1729; N. Lardner, *Vindication of Three . . . Miracles*, ib. 1729; W. Paley, *Evidences of Christianity*, ib. 1794). In addition to the representatives of supernatural

revelation already mentioned are two other movements—Evangelicalism and Wesleyism. The former as represented by Henry Venn and William Romaine (qq.v.), the latter by the Wesleys and Whitefield (qq.v.), are not a scholastic but a religious phenomenon, depending upon belief in the inspiration, inerrancy, and literal interpretation of the Scriptures, the fall and total corruption of man in sin, and the immediate consciousness of a renewed life originated by the Spirit of God.

In America during this period the chief advocate of supernaturalism as against rationalism was Jonathan Edwards (q.v.). His essay on *The Freedom of the Will* and his dissertation on *Original Sin* were a reply to treatises on original sin by John Taylor and by D. Whitby (qq.v.) written from the Arminian point of view, in which, by a use of the Scriptures which prevailed among opponents of rationalism in Great Britain, God is proved to be the efficient cause of all human action.

The course of rationalism for the next fifty years or until about 1830 shows less reliance upon individual names than upon a general movement registered in several directions. Authority

4. Entrance of Scientific Method.

whether ecclesiastical or civil in respect of religious beliefs was fast losing its hold, so that everywhere freedom of inquiry became less subject to restraint. The right of the individual consciousness was gradually gaining recognition. The age of experience, of observation, and verification had arrived wherein the slow method of induction was substituted for the "high priori road." In particular, attention is directed to two features affecting positions supposed to rest, one on the Scriptures, the other on philosophy. The beginnings of Hebrew history were subjected to the same criteria as Wolff and Niebuhr had applied to Greek and Roman history. The chief representatives here are Bishop Thirlwall, Thomas Arnold, Samuel Taylor Coleridge, and Dean Milman (qq.v.). The points on which interest centered were the story of creation, the fall and original sin, miraculous accounts as the burning bush and the sun and moon standing still, the divine authority of the judges, the integrity and authenticity of the Synoptic Gospels, in a word, many of the questions which have since become commonplaces in literary and historical criticism. The impetus to these inquiries was quickened by German scholars like Eichhorn, Michaelis, and Schleiermacher (qq.v.). In philosophical directions the tendencies were either atheistic or social as represented by Bentham, pantheistic or spiritual as represented by Coleridge, agnostic or ethical as represented by James Mill. The empiricism of Locke and Hume, the idealism of Kant, and the individualistic and socialistic teachings of the French Encyclopedists together with the matter-of-fact temper of the English mind were the main forces at work. The Evangelical movement had grown to large proportions; at the close of the eighteenth century it included about five hundred clergy, its chief representative being William Wilberforce (q.v.; *Practical View*, London, 1797).

In the following period of about thirty years, or until about 1860, appeared a remarkable group of writers, partly theological, partly scientific and literary, by whom the rational temper of English thought was still further refined.

5. Developments 1830–60.

Among those of theological significance were John Frederick Denison Maurice, Charles Kingsley, Frederick William Robertson of Brighton, and Benjamin Jowett (qq.v.). Positions already assumed are advanced to yet farther stages. Questions were raised all along the line: Old- and New-Testament criticism, miracles, natural religion, sin, the nature and character of Jesus, atonement, eternal life and eternal death. Other contemporary writings were symptoms of the new spirit, as, e.g., Robert Chambers, *Vestiges of the Creation;* F. W. Newman, *Phases of Faith;* R. W Gregg, *The Creed of Christendom;* Harriet Martineau, *Eastern Life;* also *Essays and Reviews* (q.v.) by several writers. The significance of this movement is understood only when set on the background of religious thought to which it was a protest. The Evangelical party continued the traditions of piety and reliance upon the supernatural which had marked their predecessors. On the inspiration and integrity of the Scriptures, the fall of man and original sin, regeneration, expiation for sin through the death of Christ, miracles both as prophecy and as works of power, and eternal punishment, they were generally agreed, and were vigorous advocates of the same against all rationalistic tenets. In common with the Tractarian party, until the withdrawal of John Henry Newman (q.v.) to the Roman Catholic Church in 1845, they defended the authority of the ancient symbols and church authority in general, and they subordinated reason to faith. Among the representatives of the Evangelicals were Henry Rogers and Isaac Taylor (qq.v.). The Tractarian movement went still farther in its antagonism to rationalism, defending baptismal regeneration, the real presence, exclusive prerogatives of the priesthood derived from the apostles, and authority centering in the Scriptures communicated to the Church. The chief advocates of these positions were Cardinal Newman, Richard Hurrell Froude, Edward Bouverie Pusey, and John Keble (qq.v.). In America the revolt of reason against traditional, authoritative supernaturalism found in Theodore Parker (q.v.) its most learned and outspoken advocate, and in the Unitarian churches its freest opportunity (see UNITARIANS). It was also fostered by Horace Bushnell (q.v.) in the Christian nurture of children as against the prevailing evangelistic methods of conversion, and in the growing emancipation of thought in portions of the Congregational and Presbyterian churches. No new lines of defense of supernaturalism appeared.

Since about 1860 all the rational tendencies previously active have rapidly advanced, accelerated by two new, pervasive, and radically transforming interests—Evolution and Comparative Religion (qq.v.), to which may be added the idealistic philosophy and the new psychology, and the vast extension of the scientific spirit resulting in naturalism. Rationalism has in many instances issued in atheism (cf. A. W. Benn, *History of Rationalism in the Nineteenth Century*, London, 1906), in others in

6. Since 1860.

agnosticism (cf. H. Spencer, *First Principles*, ib. 1884; T. Huxley, *Science and Culture*, ib. 1881), and in yet others, where it has not relieved Christianity of all its supernatural elements, thus reducing it to pure theism, it has set it in a wider natural order and interpreted that order no longer as simply mechanical but also as teleological. Perhaps it has influenced apologetics more profoundly than any other branch of theological inquiry, whether the point of view be conservative or liberal (see APOLOGETICS). The traditional dualism of natural and supernatural is indeed in some quarters still maintained; where, however, the divine immanence is seriously held, the line between the natural and the supernatural is disappearing, and the supernatural is the natural viewed from its causal ground or its teleological import. Thus the supernatural is reinstated not as anomalous and shrouded in mystery, but as ultimate source and final end of the rational order (see POLEMICS and THEOLOGY, the end).

C. A. BECKWITH.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. Tulloch, *Rational Theology and Christian Philosophy in England in the 17th Century*, 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1872; L. Stephen, *Hist. of Eng. Thought in the 18th Century*, 2 vols., New York, 1881; K. F. Stäudlin, *Geschichte des Rationalismus und Supranaturalismus*, Göttingen, 1826; E. B. Pusey, *Probable Causes of the Rationalist Character lately Predominant in the Theology of Germany*, London, 1828; A. Saintes, *Hist. critique du rationalisme en Allemagne*, Paris, 1841, Eng. transl., *Critical Hist. of Rationalism in Germany*, London, 1849; F. A. G. Tholuck, *Vorgeschichte des Rationalismus*, 4 vols., Berlin, 1853–62; idem, *Geschichte des Rationalismus*, vol. i., ib. 1865; A. de Gasparin, *The Schools of Doubt and the School of Faith*, Edinburgh, 1854; G. Smith, *Rational Religion*, London, 1861; A. F. Arbousse-Bastide, *Christianisme et l'esprit moderne*, Paris, 1862; A. S. Farrar, *Critical Hist. of Free Thought*, London, 1862; W. Howitt, *The Hist. of the Supernatural in all Ages and Nations*, 2 vols., Philadelphia, 1863; K. R. Hagenbach, *German Rationalism in its Rise, Progress, and Decline*, Edinburgh, 1865; W. E. H. Lecky, *Hist. of the Rise and Influence of the Spirit of Rationalism in Europe*, 2 vols., new ed., London, 1867; G. P. Fisher, *Faith and Rationalism*, New York, 1879; J. Cairns, *Unbelief in the Eighteenth Century*, London, 1881; J. Cook, *Scepticism and Rationalism*, ib. 1881; H. Coke, *Creeds of the Day*, 2 vols., ib. 1883; H. Heussler, *Der Rationalismus des siebzehnten Jahrhunderts*, Breslau, 1885; E. Costanzi, *Il Razionalismo e la Ragione storica*, Rome, 1888; C. M. Mead, *Supernatural Revelation*, London, 1890; C. Brun, *Rationalismen i dens historiske Sammenhæng med det attende Aarhundredes Oplysning*, Christiania, 1891; O. Pfleiderer, *Geschichte der protestantischen Theologie seit Kant*, Berlin, 1891; F. Utopy, *Le Rationalisme philosophique et religieux*, Paris, 1891; F. V. A. Aulard, *Culte de la raison*, Paris, 1892; J. H. King, *The Supernatural: its Origin, Nature, and Evolution*, 2 vols., London and New York, 1892; W. H. Mallock, *Studies of Contemporary Superstition*, London, 1895; K. Fischer, *Geschichte der neueren Philosophie*, vols. iii.–vii., 10 vols., Heidelberg, 1897–1903; J. M. Robertson, *Studies in Religious Fallacy*, London, 1900; idem, *Short Hist. of Free Thought*, 2d ed., 2 vols., ib. 1906; A. J. Balfour, *Foundations of Belief*, 8th ed., London, 1901; G. Forester, *The Faith of an Agnostic; or, first Essays in Rationalism*, London, 1902; J. F. Hurst, *Hist. of Rationalism*, revised ed., New York, 1902; C. E. Plumptre, *On the Progress of Liberty of Thought during Queen Victoria's Reign*, London, 1902; G. Henslow, *Present Day Rationalism*, ib. 1904; C. Watts, *The Meaning of Rationalism*, ib. 1905; A. W. Benn, *Rationalism in the Nineteenth Century*, 2 vols., ib. 1906; J. M. Robertson, *A Short History of Free Thought, Ancient and Modern*, 2 vols., 2d ed., New York, 1906; F. Podmore, *The Naturalisation of the Supernatural*, London, 1908, C. F. D'Arcy, *Christianity and the Supernatural*, ib. 1909; the works on the hist. of philosophy by J. E. Erdmann, New York, 1893, W Windelband, vol. iii., London, 1898, and F. Ueberweg, ed. Heinze, vols. iii.–iv., Berlin, 1901–02. Related literature will be found under AGNOSTICISM; ATHEISM; DEISM; ENLIGHTENMENT; MATERIALISM, etc.

RATRAMNUS, rā″trām′nus **(RATHRAMNUS):** Monk of Corbie and one of the most important theological authors of the ninth century; d. after 868. Of his life almost nothing is known, even his writings containing no biographical material; and the date of his birth, like that of his profession, can not be ascertained. He was deeply versed in Biblical and patristic learning, and theologically was a disciple of Augustine. He took part in all the theological controversies of his period, and his opinion was frequently sought by Charles the Bald, while his bishop delegated him to refute the attacks of the Patriarch Photius on the Roman Catholic Church. It is also evident that he was warmly admired by Gottschalk (*MPL*, cxxi. 367–368).

Life.

The chief work of Ratramnus was the *De corpore et sanguine Domini liber*, written at the request of Charles the Bald, probably after Paschasius Radbertus (see RADBERTUS, PASCHASIUS) had sent him his treatise on the same theme. In this work Ratramnus maintained that the eucharistic elements are not the actual body and blood of the Christ of history, but are mystic symbols of remembrance. He might, therefore, be regarded as a symbolist, seeing in the Eucharist a sacrificial meal, the efficacy of which depends on the intensity with which the recipient realizes the redeeming passion of Christ. This does not, however, completely express his position, for he maintained at the same time that "according to the invisible substance, i.e., the power of the divine Word, the body and blood of Christ are truly present" (*cap.* xlix.). This shows that Ratramnus was more than a symbolist, and that he believed in a real presence which was received by the faithful through the spirit of God. His eucharistic doctrine is elucidated by his teaching on baptism. Baptismal regeneration is not due to the water in itself, but to the Holy Ghost who enters it at the priestly consecration. Both in baptism and in the Eucharist, then, a mutable and transitory element perceptible to the senses coexists with an immutable and eternal element which faith alone can grasp. This distinction between external and internal runs, with slight inconsistencies, through the entire presentation of Ratramnus, the concomitance of the two constituting the divine mystery. The change of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ for those who receive in faith is defined by Ratramnus as due to the sanctification of the Holy Ghost invisibly contained in the sacraments, or as the spiritual power of the Word immanent in the material substances ("Word" here seeming to mean the words of institution as spoken by the priest at the consecration of the elements rather than the Scriptures in general or the Logos). It would furthermore appear that he held that the Eucharist is the visible vehicle of invisible grace, and that in the sacrament the power of God, under its material veil, secretly works the salvation to which the Eucharist testifies. The eucharistic teaching of Ratramnus thus approximated

Doctrine of the Eucharist.

one side of the doctrine of Radbertus (q.v.), the difference being merely in their concept of "truly" in the transformation of the sacramental elements, Radbertus making this include both symbol and substance, while Ratramnus understood by the term a presence cognoscible to the senses, and so combated it. While, therefore, he taught a real change of the elements, in virtue of priestly consecration, not only in signification, but also in efficacy, this change was perceptible only to faith, not to the senses.

The *De corpore et sanguine Domini* of Ratramnus has had a strange history. The synod of Vercelli, in 1050, condemned and burned it as a work composed by Johannes Scotus Erigena (see Scotus Erigena, Johannes) at the instance of Charles the Bald; and during the Middle Ages its very existence was well-nigh forgotten. In 1526, however, John Fisher, bishop of Rochester, appealed to it in his controversy with Œcolampadius. Attention was thus again drawn to it, and in 1532 it was edited at Cologne by Johannes Prael under the title of *Bertrami presbyteri ad Carolum Magnum imperatorem.* It was then repeatedly edited and translated, especially in French and English (e.g., London, 1548, 1581, 1624, 1686, 1838, 1880). The appeals of Protestants, especially of the Reformed wing, to it rendered it an object of suspicion to the Roman Catholic Church, and as a Protestant forgery it was placed on the Index by the censors of the Council of Trent in 1559. This unfavorable view was shared by the leading Roman Catholic scholars of the period, and though others maintained its authenticity and orthodoxy, it was not removed from the Index until 1900.

The other writings of Ratramnus may be dismissed more briefly. The earliest of his works seems to have been the *De eo quod Christus ex Virgine natus est,* on the contents and relation of which to Radbertus' *De partu Virginis* see Radbertus, Paschasius. He was active in the Gottschalk controversy, was indeed a personal friend of the monk of Fulda (see Gottschalk, 1). In 850, at the request of Charles the Bald, he wrote his two books, *De prædestinatione Dei,* in which he defended the doctrine of twofold predestination to salvation and damnation, but rejected the theory of a predestination to sin. Between 853 and 855 he wrote an apology of the *Trina Deitas* (now lost), assailing Hincmar's proposed change of *te, trina Deitas unaque* in the hymn "Sanctorum meritis inclyta gaudia" into *te, summa Deitas,* his reasons being suspected Sabellianism. Ratramnus gained his chief fame by his four books *Contra Græcorum opposita,* written about 868 in reply to the attacks of Photius (q.v.) on the *Filioque* and other differences between East and West. The first book is devoted to the demonstration from the Bible of the doctrine of the double procession, and the second and third to proofs from the councils and the Greek and Latin Fathers. Particular interest attaches to the first chapter of the fourth book, in which Ratramnus touches upon one of the chief points of difference between the Greek and Latin Churches. The Eastern Church traces not only its dogma, but also its ecclesiastical rites and customs, back to the apostolic age, and forbids the slightest deviation; while the Church of the West, especially after the time of Augustine, permits variations in forms of observance according to the necessities of place and time, though maintaining the same inflexibility of dogma as the East. The remainder of the concluding book is occupied with the justification of distinctively Roman usages, such as celibacy and the tonsure.

Other Writings.

Ratramnus also wrote a curious *Epistola de cynocephalis ad Rimbertum presbyterum,* this Rimbert probably being the biographer and successor of Ansgar (q.v.). Here Ratramnus decides that, though most theologians are inclined to consider the cynocephali as animals rather than men, the human traits in their mode of life imply the possession of reason, so that there is no good reason to object to the view that they are descendants of Adam. In this same work he also denies complete authority to the "Book of St. Clement" (probably the "Recognitions"), on the ground that it is not in entire harmony with the doctrines of the Church. In his *De anima* Ratramnus polemized against the theory of a certain Macarius Scotus (who had misunderstood a passage in Augustine's *De quantitate animæ*) that all mankind have a single soul in common. The work, which has never been edited, is described, from a manuscript apparently now lost, by Jean Mabillon (*ASM,* iii. 140; *ASB,* IV., ii. 76). In another work, likewise unedited, Ratramnus refutes the theory that the soul is circumscribed, or restricted by limits of space (cf. L. Traube, in *MGH, Poet. Lat. med. ævi,* iii. 2 [1896], 715). All the works of Ratramnus thus far edited are collected in the reprint in *MPL,* cxxi. 1–346, 1153–56, while his letters are given in *MGH, Epist.,* vi. 1 (1902), 149 sqq.

Like Radbertus and most other theologians of the Carolingian and succeeding centuries, Ratramnus was a traditionalist, drawing on and systematizing patristic literature primarily for polemic purposes and for establishing his intense Augustinianism. Through his controversial writings runs a noble strain, personal attack is avoided, and demonstration of the truth is the one and only end. He is likewise noteworthy because of the attention given his writings in the Reformed Church and during the period of the Enlightenment, even though he had been unrecognized by the "Magdeburg Centuries" and by early Lutheranism. (A. Hauck.)

Bibliography: A. Naegle, *Ratramnus und die heilige Eucharistie,* Vienna, 1903; *Hist. littéraire de la France,* v. 332–351; J. Bach, *Dogmengeschichte des Mittelalters,* i. 193 sqq., Vienna, 1873; A. Ebert, *Geschichte der Litteratur des Mittelalters,* ii. 244, Leipsic, 1880; J. Schwane, *Dogmengeschichte der mittleren Zeit,* pp. 631 sqq., Freiburg, 1882; J. Schweizer, *Berengar von Tours,* pp. 150–174, Munich, 1890; J. Ernst, *Die Lehre des . Paschasius Radbertus von der Eucharistie,* pp. 99 sqq., Freiburg, 1896; Harnack, *Dogma,* v. 297, 302, 310, 318 sqq., vi. 47–48; Neander, *Christian Church,* iii. 482, 497–501; Schaff, *Christian Church,* iv. 304, 532, 549 sqq., 746 sqq.; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés,* xii. 555–568, 594; *KL,* x. 802–807.

RATZ, rāts, **JAKOB:** German Lutheran; b. at Saulheim (a village s. of Mainz) 1505; d. at Heilbronn (26 m. n. of Stuttgart) 1565. He was educated at the University of Mainz, and, though an admirer of Erasmus, seems to have entered a monastery. He later went to Wittenberg to hear Luther

and Melanchthon, and, after acting in an ecclesiastical capacity in Dinkelsbühl and being deacon at Crailsheim (1534), was pastor at Neckarbischofsheim (until 1540), Neuenstadt-on-the-Linde (until 1552), Pforzheim, and probably in the Palatinate (until 1556 or 1557), resigning shortly after the accession of Frederick III. In May, 1559, he was called to Heilbronn to succeed Menrad Molther (q.v.) as pastor, a position which he retained until his death. He was able and gifted, but violent and somewhat inconsiderate. His writings treat of several interesting problems of early Protestant dogma and ethics, as when he opposed Melchior Ambach in his vindication of dancing and other amusements. Among his works mention may also be made of his disquisition on fasting (1553) and of his *Von der Hellen* (Nuremberg, 1545).

G. BOSSERT.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A sketch of the life and works of Ratz by G. Bossert is in *Blätter für württembergische Kirchengeschichte*, 1893, pp. 33 sqq., 1907, pp. 1 sqq.

RATZEBERGER, MATTHÆUS: German physician and lay theologian; b. at Wangen (5 m. e. of Stuttgart) 1501; d. at Erfurt Jan. 3, 1559. He was educated at Wittenberg, and early made the acquaintance of Luther, for whom he cherished a lifelong veneration. He left Wittenberg in 1525 to become city physician at Brandenburg, and there met the electress, whom he is said to have induced to study the writings of Luther. When, however, she fled to Saxony, Ratzeberger's career at Brandenburg was at an end, and he then became physician to Count Albrecht of Mansfeld, while in 1538 he entered the service of John Frederick, elector of Saxony, in the same capacity. He was a medical adviser of Luther, with whom he was apparently connected by marriage, and after the Reformer's death was one of the guardians of his children. Such was Ratzeberger's reputation for theological learning that in 1546 Friedrich Myconius (q.v.) proposed him as one of the speakers at the Conference of Regensburg (see REGENSBURG, CONFERENCE OF). His meddlesome and officious nature [or, perhaps, his conscientious performance of duty], however, brought about his enforced retirement from attendance on John Frederick, whereupon he settled at Nordhausen as a practitioner. In 1550 he removed to Erfurt, where he watched with increasing dissatisfaction the growth of Philippism.

The chief literary production of Ratzeberger was his *Historia Lutheri* (first edited completely by C. G. Neudecker, *Die handschriftliche Geschichte Ratzebergers über Luther und seine Zeit*, Jena, 1850). The first part of this work contains a biography of Luther, but its meager and anecdotic character is disappointing, considering that it was written by one who had associated so long and so closely with the Reformer. The second portion is devoted to the Schmalkald War and similar matters. The rancor displayed toward the advisers of the elector, and toward the Wittenberg theologians, especially Melanchthon, renders Ratzeberger's work valueless as history, although it is important for its data on the Gnesio-Lutherans, and, despite its partizanship, for the controversies of the Interim. (T. KOLDE.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A. Poach, *Vom christlichen Abschied . . . des . . . M. Ratzebergers*, Jena, 1559; G. T. Strobel, *Matthäi Razebergers Geschichte*, Altdorf, 1775.

RATZEBURG, BISHOPRIC OF: A German diocese founded by Archbishop Adalbert of Hamburg, who consecrated as its first bishop a Greek named Aristo (between 1062 and 1066). The uprising of the Wends, however, put an end to Christianity in their territory, and it was not until they had been subdued by Henry the Lion that the diocese could be reestablished. The first bishop of the revived see was Evermod, who had formerly been prior of St. Mary in Magdeburg, and as he was a Premonstratensian, the chapter of the diocese was filled with members from that order. The bishopric was bounded on the north by the Baltic, on the south by the Elbe, on the east by the Elde, and on the west by the Bille. In 1167 the diocese was somewhat diminished by the annexation of Schwerin to Mecklenburg. [The diocese came to an end in 1554, when the bishop, Christoph von dem Schulenburg, resigned and became a Lutheran.] (A. HAUCK.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sources are: *Meklenburgisches Urkundenbuch*, 12 vols., Schwerin, 1863 sqq.; *Schleswig-Holstein-Lauenburgische Regesten und Urkunden*, ed. P. Hasse, 3 vols., Hamburg, 1886 sqq. Consult: C. F. L. Arndt, *Das Zehntenregister des Bistums Ratzeburg*, Schönberg, 1833; G. M. C. Masch, *Geschichte des Bistums Ratzeburg*, Lübeck, 1835; G. Dehio, *Geschichte des Erzbistums Hamburg-Bremen*, 2 vols., Berlin, 1878; M. Schmidt, *Beschreibung und Chronik der Stadt Ratzeburg*, Ratzeburg, 1882; A. Rudloff, *Geschichte Mecklenburgs*, Berlin, 1901; Gams, *Series episcoporum*, p. 304; Hauck, *KD*, vols., iii.–iv.

RAUCH, FREDERICK AUGUSTUS: German Reformed educator; b. at Kirchbracht, Hesse-Darmstadt, July 27, 1806; d. at Mercersburg, Pa., Mar. 2, 1841. He entered the University of Marburg in 1824, and studied philosophy and theology at Giessen and Heidelberg; was extraordinary professor of philosophy at Giessen one year and was appointed ordinary professor at Heidelberg; but on account of some political utterance which evoked the displeasure of the government he fled to America in 1831. He obtained a livelihood for a while by giving lessons on the pianoforte at Easton, Pa.; but was soon made professor of German in Lafayette College. In 1832 he assumed charge of a classical academy established by the German Reformed Church at York, Pa., and a few months later was ordained and appointed professor of Biblical literature in the theological seminary, while retaining charge of the academy, which in 1835 was transferred to Mercersburg and in 1836 transformed to Mercersburg College, of which he was the first president, 1836–41. Rauch was an eminent scholar in classical literature, mental and moral science, and esthetics; and it was his ambition to organize upon American soil an Anglo-German system of thought. He published only *Psychology, or a View of the Human Soul, including Anthropology* (New York, 1840; 3d ed., 1844); his *Inner Life of the Christian* appeared posthumously (ed. E. V Gerhart, Philadelphia, 1856).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A eulogy by J. W. Nevin is in *Mercersburg Review*, xi (1859), 456 sqq. Consult also J. H. Dubbs, in *American Church History Series*, viii. 355, 357 sqq., 364–368, New York, 1895.

RAUHES HAUS. See WICHERN, JOHANN HINRICH; DEACON, IV.

RAUSCHEN, rau'shen, **GERHARD:** German Roman Catholic; b. at Heinsberg (33 m. s.w. of Düsseldorf), Prussia, Oct. 13, 1854. He was educated at the University of Bonn (1874–77) and in 1877 was ordained to the priesthood at Roermond, Holland. He was teacher in a gymnasium at Andernach (1889–92) and at Bonn (1892–97). In 1897 he became privat-docent for church history at the university of the same city, where he has been associate professor of the history of religion since 1902. He has written *Ephemerides Tullianæ* (Bonn, 1886); *Die Legende Karls des Grossen im elften und zwölften Jahrhundert* (Leipsic, 1890); *Jahrbuch der christlichen Kirche unter Theodosius dem Grossen* (Freiburg, 1897); *Das griechisch-römische Schulwesen zur Zeit des ausgehenden Heidentums* (Bonn, 1901); *Grundriss der Patrologie mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Dogmengeschichte* (Freiburg, 1903); *Florilegium patristicum* (7 parts, Bonn, 1904–09); *Die wichtigeren neuen Funde aus dem Gebiete der ältesten Kirchengeschichte* (1905); text books on church history, dogmatics, and apologetics (4 parts, 1907–08); and *Eucharistie und Busssakrament in den ersten sechs Jahrhunderten der Kirche* (Freiburg, 1908).

RAUSCHENBUSCH, AUGUSTUS: Baptist; b. at Altona (41 m. n.e. of Cologne) Feb. 13, 1816; d. at Hamburg 1899. He came of a long line of Lutheran pastors and authors; studied at the universities of Berlin and Bonn; was pastor at Altona in succession to his father, 1841–45; emigrated in 1845 to America to serve among his countrymen there; was German secretary and editor for the American Tract Society, 1846–53; in 1850 he became a Baptist, and served German Baptist churches in Missouri, 1853–58; was head of the German department in Rochester Theological Seminary, 1858–90; returned to Germany in 1890 and spent the rest of his life there in literary labors. Among his books may be noted *Geschichte der Erzväter* (New York, 1859); *Die Bedeutung des Fusswaschens Christi* (Hamburg, 1861); *Die Vorläufer der Reformation* (Cleveland, O., 1875); *Gehören die Apokryphen in der Bibel hinein* (Hamburg, 1895); *Die Entstehung der Kindertaufe* (1897); *Biblische Frauenbilder* (1897); *Die Entstehung der Kindertaufe im 3. Jahrhundert nach Christum und die Wiedereinführung der biblischen Taufe im 17 Jahrhundert* (1898); and *Handbüchlein der Homiletik für freikirchliche Prediger und für Stadtmissionäre* (Cassel, 1900).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *Leben und Wirken von August Rauschenbusch*, Cassel and Cleveland, Ohio, 1901 (by himself and his son Walter, q.v.).

RAUSCHENBUSCH, rau'shen-bush, **WALTER:** Baptist, son of the preceding; b. in Rochester, N. Y., Oct. 4, 1861. He received his education at the Rochester Free Academy, the classical gymnasium at Gütersloh, Germany (1879–83), University of Rochester (B.A., 1884), Rochester Theological Seminary (graduated 1886), with supplementary studies in Germany (1891–92 and 1907–08); he was pastor of the Second German Baptist Church, New York City, 1886–97; professor of New-Testament interpretation in the German department of Rochester Theological Seminary, 1897–1902; and of church history in the seminary since 1902. His principal work is *Christianity and the Social Crisis* (New York, 1907), which has run through several editions. Besides this other works worthy of mention are *Das Leben Jesu* (Cleveland, Ohio, 1895); *Leben und Wirken von August Rauschenbusch* (Cassel, 1901); *The New Evangelism* (New York, 1904); *For God and the People* (1910; prayers); and the sections dealing with American church history in the *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte*, ed. G. Krüger (Tübingen, 1909).

RAUTENBERG, rau'ten-bārh, **JOHANN WILHELM:** German Protestant and one of the foremost preachers of his day; b. at Moorfleth (a village near Hamburg) Mar. 1, 1791; d. at Hamburg Mar. 1, 1865. After being forced to flee from Hamburg in 1813 because of his part in the deliverance of Hamburg from the French, he studied at the universities of Kiel (1813–16) and Berlin (1816–17). He then returned to Hamburg, where he supported himself chiefly as a private tutor until 1820, when he was chosen pastor of St. George (now part of the city of Hamburg). There he labored for nearly forty-five years, and there, on Jan. 9, 1825, he opened a Sunday-school to give elementary secular instruction as well as religious training to those children who were deprived of opportunities for such teaching during the week. Despite much opposition, this school not only developed into a week-day school and even into the St. George Stiftskirche, but was ultimately responsible for the establishment of the Rauhes Haus (see WICHERN, JOHANN HINRICH). Rautenberg's theological position was throughout one of unswerving orthodoxy and devotion. His chief writings were as follows: *Denkblätter* (13 parts, Hamburg, 1821–33); two volumes of sermons (ed. H. Sengelmann, Hamburg, 1866–1867); and two hymnals, *Festliche Nachklänge* (1865) and *Hirtenstimmen* 1866; both edited by H. Sengelmann). (CARL BERTHEAU.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: H. Sengelmann, *Zum Gedächtnis Johann Wilhelm Rautenbergs*, Hamburg, 1865; F. A. Löwe, *Denkwürdigkeiten aus dem Leben und Wirken des J. W Rautenbergs*, ib. 1866; J. H. Höck, *Bilder aus der Geschichte der hamburgischen Kirche*, pp. 323 sqq., ib. 1900; *ADB*, xxvii. 457 sqq.; P. Lange, *Johann Wilhelm Rautenberg*, Berlin, 1900.

RAUTENSTRAUCH, rau'ten-strauh, **FRANZ STEPHAN:** Austrian Roman Catholic; b. at Platten (14 m. n. of Elbogen), Bohemia, July 26, 1734; d. at Erlau (67 m. n.e. of Budapest), Hungary, Sept. 30, 1785. He entered the Benedictine order at Brewnow, where he taught philosophy, canon law, and theology. After he had been raised by Maria Theresa to the prelacy of the united monasteries of Braunen and Brewnow in 1773, and, in 1774, to the directorship of the theological faculty of Prague and later of Vienna, he prepared his *Neue allerhöchste Instruction für alle theologischen Facultäten in den kaiserlich-königlichen Erblanden* (Vienna, 1776), in which he insisted upon the study of the Scriptures in the original, of hermeneutics and of church history, and urged the students not to attend lectures on dogmatics before their third year of study; then should follow the practical branches, among which especial stress was laid on catechetics.

Polemics should be the last subject, and this should be so treated that the system of each sect would first be presented in its entirety and then be refuted. Rautenstrauch actively advocated the reforms of Joseph II., but was bitterly opposed by the Jesuits. Among his writings special mention should be made of his *Institutiones juris ecclesiastici* (Prague, 1769) and *Synopsis juris ecclesiastici* (Vienna, 1776). (J. J. HERZOG†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: C. von Wurzbach, *Biographisches Lexicon des Kaiserthums Oesterreich*, xxv. 67 sqq., Vienna, 1856 sqq.; *ADB*, xxvii. 459.

RAUWENHOFF, rau'ven-hef, **LODEWIJK WILLEM ERNST:** Dutch Protestant; b. at Amsterdam July 27, 1828; d. at Moran (15 m. n.w. of Bozen), Austria, Jan. 26, 1889. He was educated at the universities of Amsterdam and Leyden (1846–1852), and was then minister at Mydrecht (1852–1856), Dort (1856–59), and Leyden (1859–60). In 1860 he was appointed professor of church history at Leyden, a chair which he exchanged in 1881 for that of encyclopedics and the philosophy of religion. The latter position he retained until his death. Theologically Rauwenhoff was a pronounced and optimistic radical, utterly contemptuous of orthodoxy; but he crystallized the vague tendencies and concepts of the critical school of Dutch theology, instead of himself becoming a pioneer worker and leader. He was thus a natural advocate of the separation of Church and State and of the purely scientific teaching of theology in the universities. His attitude toward church history—that the facts of history are valuable only in their philosophic implications—finds its expression in his *Geschiedenis van het protestantisme* (3 vols., Haarlem, 1865–71), in which he proceeded from authoritative Christianity to an individualistic religion made to agree with science and the demands of modern life. The views of Rauwenhoff on the philosophy of religion were set forth in his *Wijsbegeerte van den godsdienst* (Leyden, 1887). He was also the author of many briefer contributions, one of the founders and editors of the *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, and for many years a member of the General Synod.

RAVENNA, rā-ven'nā: Name of province, city, and archbishopric in northeastern Italy. The city is situated six miles from the Adriatic and seventy-two miles south of Venice. It was a naval station of the Romans under the Empire, and is, next to Rome, the most important city in Italy in connection with the history of Christian art, marking the transition from the early to the medieval from the fifth to the eighth centuries. Under Honorius (402 or 404) it became the seat of empire (402–476) and it was the capital of the Ostrogoth kings after 493 and the seat of the Byzantine exarchs, 539–752. Taken by the Lombards (q.v.) in 752, it was conquered by Pippin in 755 and presented to the pope. Traditionally, the apostle and first bishop of Ravenna was Apollinaris, a disciple of Peter (martyred c. 78). After the removal of the seat of empire from Rome to Ravenna the bishopric was raised to metropolitan dignity by Valentinian III.; and the first archbishop, according to one tradition, was Johannes Angeloptes, who died in 433. The sway of the popes over the city, however, did not continue undisputed; the city was more or less dependent upon the archbishops and these in turn upon the resident emperors or exarchs. The schismatic Archbishop Maurus (648–671) rendered himself independent of the pope and was sustained by Emperor Constans II. For denying the right of consecration he was anathematized and in turn hurled the ban upon the pope. Reparatus (671–677) and Theodorus (677–688) received the pallium from the emperor and were ordained by their suffragans. The conflict to maintain a complete independence of Rome continued in varying degrees until the end of the ninth century; and under Henry III., in 1044, Ravenna became a free imperial city and the archbishop an imperial vassal, with the result of repeated conflicts with the papal see (see PAPAL STATES). The disturbances between the Guelfs and the Ghibellines resulted in a vacancy, 1270–74. Ravenna was again attached to the papal realm after 1509 and 1815–60. The city has besides the cathedral (built 380) twenty-one churches. Most famous are the baptistery of San Giovanni (430) containing the earliest known mosaics and reliefs of the fifth century; the San Nazario e Celso, or the mausoleum of Empress Galla Placida, patroness of church-building, containing her huge sarcophagus. It is the earliest example of a vaulted cruciform structure surmounted at the intersection by a lofty dome. An example of the Gothic or Arian period is the San Apollinare Nuovo (504) built as the Arian cathedral. Surpassing all is the Byzantine San Vitale (526–547) commemorating the patron saint and martyr and copied after St. Sophia. An interesting and famous monument is the mausoleum of Theodoric the Great, built by himself about 520. It is known as the Rotonda or Santa Maria della Rotonda. The structure served in the Middle Ages as the church of the neighboring Benedictine monastery, but reverted in 1719 to its purpose as the memorial of the emperor. Here is also the famous tomb of Dante (q.v.) who came to this city in 1320. The present ecclesiastical province includes the suffragan bishoprics of Bertinoro and Soisina, Cervia, Cesena, Comacchio, Forli, and Rimini.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Hieronymus Rubeus, *Historiarum libri x.*, Venice, 1572; G. G. Ciampini, *Vetera monimenta*, 2 vols., Rome, 1690–99; A. F. von Quast, *Die altchristlichen Bauwerke von Ravenna*, Berlin, 1842; J. Hare, *Cities of Northern and Central Italy*, 3 vols., London, 1876; E. Freeman, *Historical Essays*, 3d series, London, 1879; C. Ricci, *Cronache e Documenti per la Storia Ravennate*, Bologna, 1882; idem, *Ravenna*, Ravenna, 1902; T. Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders*, vols., i.–iii., Oxford, 1892–1895; C. Diehl, *Ravenne*, Paris, 1903; Gams, *Series episcoporum*, pp. 716–718, and Supplement, p. 5; Muratori, *Scriptores*, vol. ii (contains the lives of early bishops of Ravenna); *KL*, x. 820–839.

RAVIGNAN, rā''vî''nyān', **GUSTAVE FRANÇOIS XAVIER DE LA CROIX DE:** Roman Catholic; b. at Bayonne Dec. 2, 1795; d. in Paris Feb. 26, 1858. He was educated in the Lycée Bonaparte; studied law, and had already begun practising as an advocate in Paris, when he entered the order of the Jesuits and the Seminary of St. Sulpice. When the Jesuits were expelled from France, in 1830, he repaired to Switzerland, and became a teacher at Freiburg; but in 1835 he returned to France, and

in 1837 he succeeded Lacordaire as preacher of Notre Dame. He was considered one of the greatest preachers of his time, vehement in pathos, trenchant in irony, audacious but compelling in argument. In 1848 he retired to his convent on account of ill-health. He published *De l'existence et de l'institute des jésuites* (Paris, 1844; 10th ed., 1901), and *Clément XIII. et Clément XIV* (2 vols., 1854).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A. de Ponlevoy, *Vie du R. P. Xavier de Ravignan*, 2 vols., Paris, 1860, Eng. transl., *Life of Father Ravignan*, New York, 1869; J. Poujoulat, *Le Père Ravignan*, Paris, 1859.

RAWLINSON, rō'lin-sun, **GEORGE:** Church of England, commentator and orientalist; b. at Chadlington (14 m. n.w. of Oxford), Oxfordshire, Nov. 23, 1812; d. at Canterbury Oct. 6, 1902. He entered Trinity College, Oxford (B.A., 1838; M.A., Exeter College, 1841); was ordained deacon 1841, and priest 1842; was fellow of Exeter College, 1840–46; tutor, 1842–1846; sub-rector, 1844–45; curate of Merton, Oxfordshire, 1846–47; classical moderator at Oxford, 1852–54; public examiner, 1855–57, 1868–69, 1875–79; Bampton lecturer, 1859; Camden professor of ancient history, Oxford, 1861–89; proctor for the chapter in convocation of Canterbury, 1873–1898; after 1872 canon of Canterbury; and after 1888 rector of All Hallows, Lombard Street.

His publications were, commentaries on Joshua, I and II Kings, I and II Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther (London, 1873), in *The Bible (Speaker's) Commentary;* on Exodus (1882) in *An Old Testament Commentary* by C. J. Ellicott; and on Exodus (1882), II Kings (1889), Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther (1880), Job (1892), Isaiah (1886–87), and Psalms (1896), in *The Pulpit Commentary*. He was the editor of *History of Herodotus*, with copious notes and appendices, in collaboration with Henry Rawlinson and J. G. Wilkinson (4 vols., London, 1858–60; with notes abridged by A. J. Grant, 2 vols., 1897); *The Historical Evidences of the Truth of the Scripture Records* (Bampton lectures for 1859; 1859); *The Contrasts of Christianity with Heathen and Jewish Systems* (1861); *The Five Great Monarchies of the Ancient Eastern World* (4 vols., 1862–67); *The Sixth Great Oriental Monarchy* (1873), *The Seventh Great Oriental Monarchy* (1876), the last three frequently republished and reprinted collectively under the title *The Seven Great Monarchies of the Ancient Eastern World; A Manual of Ancient History* (e. g., New York, 1889); *Historical Illustrations of the Old Testament* (London, 1871); *St. Paul in Damascus and Arabia* (1877); *The History of Ancient Egypt* (2 vols., 1881); *The Religions of the Ancient World* (1882); *Egypt and Babylon from Scripture and Profane Sources* (1884); *Bible Topography* (1886); *Ancient Egypt* (1887); *Phœnicia* (1889), and *Parthia* (1893), in *The Story of the Nations* series; *Ancient History* (1887); *Moses, His Life and Times* (1887), *The Kings of Israel and Judah* (1889), *Isaac and Jacob* (1890), and *Ezra and Nehemiah* (1891), in *The Men of the Bible* series; and *The History of Phœnicia* (1889).

RAWNSLEY, rōns'lî, **HARDWICKE DRUMMOND:** Church of England; b. at Henley-on-Thames (23 m. s.e. of Oxford) Sept. 28, 1850. He was educated at Balliol College, Oxford (B.A., 1875), and was ordered deacon in 1875 and ordained priest two years later. He was curate of St. Barnabas, Bristol (1875–78); vicar of Low Wray, Lancastershire (1878–83); vicar of Crosthwaite, Keswick, Cumberland (since 1883); and has also been rural dean of Keswick and honorary canon of Carlisle since 1893. He has written *Book of Bristol Sonnets* (London, 1877); *Sonnets at the English Lakes* (1881); *Sonnets round the Coast* (1887); *Edward Thring, Teocher and Poet* (1889); *Poems, Ballads, and Bucolics* (1890); *St. Kentigern of Crosthwaite and St. Herbert of Derwentwater* (3d ed., Keswick, 1892); *Notes for the Nile: Hymns of Ancient Egypt* (1892); *Valete Tennyson, and other Poems* (1893); *Idylls and Lyrics of the Nile* (1894); *Literary Associations of the English Lakes* (2 vols., 1894); *Ballads of Brave Deeds* (1896); *Harvey Goodwin, Bishop of Carlisle: A Biographical Memoir* (1896); *Henry Whitehead, 1825–96: Memorial Sketch* (Glasgow, 1897); *Sayings of Jesus: Six Village Sermons on the Papyrus Fragment* (1897); *Life and Nature at the English Lakes* (1899); *Sonnets in Switzerland and Italy* (London, 1899); *Ballads of the War* (1900); *Memories of the Tennysons* (Glasgow, 1900); *Ruskin and the English Lakes* (1901); *A Rambler's Note-Book at the English Lakes* (1902); *Lake Country Sketches* (1903); *Flower-Time in the Oberland* (1904); *Venerable Bede, his Life and Work* (London, 1904); *Sermons on the Logia* (2 series, 1905); *Months at the Lakes* (1906); *A Sonnet Chronicle, 1900–05* (1906); *Round the Lake Country* (1909); and *Poems at Home and Abroad* (1909). He also edited a collection of sermons under the title of *Christ for To-Day* (London, 1885).

RAYMOND, MARTINI: Spanish Dominican and rabbinical scholar of the thirteenth century. He was a native of Catalonia, and was in 1250 one of eight monks appointed to make a study of oriental languages with the purpose of carrying on a mission to Jews and Moors. In 1264 he was one of the company appointed by the king of Aragon to examine Jewish manuscripts in order to strike out from them any matter assailing Christianity. He worked in Spain as a missionary, and also for a short time in Tunis. A document bearing his signature and dated July, 1284, shows that he was at that time still living.

Raymond's refutation of the Koran is lost. There is at Bologna a manuscript of his *Capistrum Judœorum*, aimed at the errors of the Jews; and at Tortosa a manuscript containing *Explanatio simboli apostolorum ad institutionem fidelium* has a marginal note that it was edited by "*a fratre Ro Martini de ordine predicatorum.*" The great work with which Raymond's name is associated is his *Pugio fidei*, on which he was still at work in 1278. This work was used by Hieronymus de Saneta Fide in his *Hebræomastix* and elsewhere, was plagiarized by Petrus Galatinus, and was one of the credited sources of Victor Porchet's *Victoria adversus impios Ebreos* (Paris, 1520). About 1620 Bishop Bosquet discovered in the Collegium Fuxense a manuscript of the *Pugio*, and from this and three other manuscripts Joseph de Voisin edited the work with numerous learned annotations (Paris, 1651; edited again with introduction by J. B. Carpzov, Leipsic, 1687). The first part treats of God and divine omniscience, creation, immortality, and resurrection from the dead; the second and third parts are devoted to refutation of the Jews. The second and third parts are still of value for missions, and also for science since there are numerous correctly cited quotations from the Talmud, Midrashic works, and other early Jewish literature. Among these cited works is the *Bereshith Rabba major* or *magna*, a work in part derived from the *Yesodh* of Moses ha-Darshan. In his use of this work the only charge that can be

brought against Raymond is that he disconnected sentences from their context and assembled them in accordance with his subjective interpretation and his purpose in writing.

The question, who is meant by the " Rachmon " often adduced by Raymond, is not definitely answered, some scholars considering that it is a Hebraizing of his own name, and not a character introduced as speaking in the Talmud and Midrash.

(H. L. STRACK.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A. Touron, *Hist. des hommes illustres de l'ordre de St. Dominique*, i. 489–504, Paris, 1743; Ambrose of Altramura, *Bibliotheca Dominicana*, ed. Rocaberti, pp. 58, 449–455, Rome, 1677; J. C. Wolf, *Bibliotheca Hebræa*, i. 1016–18, iii. 989–991, iv. 968, Hamburg, 1715–33; J. Quétif and J. Echard, *Scriptores ordinis prædicatorum*, i. 396–398, Paris, 1719; and literature named in J. G. Walch, *Bibliotheca theologica selecta*, i. 609, Jena, 1757. The charge that Raymond falsified his citations from Jewish writings was renewed by S. M. Schiller-Szinessy in *Journal of Philology*, xvi (1887), 131–152; refutation of the charge is offered by L. Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden*, pp. 287–293, Berlin, 1832; E. B. Pusey, *Fifty-Third Chapter of Isaiah*, vol. ii., Oxford, 1877; A. Neubauer, *Book of Tobit*, pp. vii.–ix., xx.–xxv., ib. 1878; A. Epstein, in *Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, 1888, pp. 65–99, cf. I. Levi, in *Revue des études juives*, xvii (1888), 313–317.

RAYMOND, MINER: Methodist Episcopal; b. at New York Aug. 29, 1811; d. at Evanston, Ill., Nov. 25, 1897. He was educated at the Wesleyan Academy, Wilbraham, Mass.; became teacher in the same, 1834, and was principal, 1848–64; was pastor in Massachusetts after 1841; and professor of systematic theology in Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill., from 1864. He published *Systematic Theology* (3 vols., Cincinnati, 1877).

RAYMOND, SAINT, OF PENNAFORTE: B. at Barcelona toward the close of the twelfth century; d. Jan. 6, 1275. He studied in his native city and at Bologna; was made canon in the cathedral of Barcelona; entered the Dominican order in 1222; was made confessor to Gregory IX. in 1230, and general of his order in 1238; but resigned in 1240 in order to devote himself to the conversion of the heretics and unbelievers in Spain. He was canonized in 1601, and his day is Jan 23. He wrote a *Compilatio nova decretalium Gregorii IX.* (Strasburg, 1470?); *Dubitalia cum responsionibus ad quædam capita missa ad pontificem* (published by J. F von Schulte, Vienna, 1868); and a *Summa de pœnitentia et matrimonio* (Rome, 1603).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: G. Phillips, *Kirchenrecht*, iv. 252–303, 7 vols., Regensburg, 1845–72; J. F. von Schulte, *Geschichte der Quellen und Literatur des canonischen Rechts*, ii. 408–413, Stuttgart, 1877; *KL*, x. 755–757.

RAYMUNDUS LULLUS. See LULLY, RAYMOND.

RAYNALDUS, ODERICUS. See RINALDI, ODORICO.

READER. See LECTOR.

REALISM. See SCHOLASTICISM.

REAL PRESENCE. See LORD'S SUPPER; TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

REBEKAH BIBLE. See BIBLE VERSIONS, B, IV., § 9.

RECHABITES, rec'a-baits: A clan of the Kenites, noted for adherence to the commands of one of their early elders. The fundamental passage for knowledge of the Rechabites is Jer. xxxv. 1 sqq. According to this, during the siege of Jerusalem by Nebuchadrezzar, Jeremiah invited into the Temple the Rechabites who had fled to Jerusalem before the Babylonian armies, and set wine before them. They refused to drink it in spite of his urging, giving as their reason the prohibition against wine by Jonadab, son of Rechab, their ancestor. The fidelity with which the Rechabites observed these commands, served Jeremiah as a text for a denunciation of faithless Judah, which did not keep the commands of its God with equal fidelity. Besides this passage, the ancestor, if not the clan, is described in II Kings x. 15–16 as being in earnest accord with the reforming purposes of Jehu. Finally the Rechabites are noted in I Chron. ii. 55 among the " families of the scribes who dwelt at Jabez " as " the Kenites that came of Hamath the father of the house of Rechab." This is after the return from the Babylonian captivity.

There is little doubt that the Rechabites were nomads who clung to their primitive habits when Israel had advanced to the agricultural stage. They worshiped Yahweh, but it was the Yahweh whom Israel had worshiped in the desert. It is, therefore, intelligible that, in the days of Elisha and Elijah, when the worship of Baal threatened to drive out that of Yahweh, a religious community could be formed under the leadership of a Jonadab ben Rechab, which rejected everything savoring of Canaanite civilization. The name Rechab was, naturally, only a tribal appellation. The esteem enjoyed by the community is proved by the fact that Jehu believed he could conciliate the people after his bloody deeds by having Jonadab with him on his chariot. The Rechabites who sought refuge in Jerusalem, in Jeremiah's time, seem to have had a semi-spiritual position, and, in consequence of the events of the time, were forced to give up their nomadic life. They probably shared the captivity of the inhabitants, and after their return seem to have abandoned their exceptional position and possibly became a race of scribes. (R. KITTEL.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Commentaries on Jeremiah, e.g., W. H. Bennett, pp. xxi.–lii., 44 sqq., London, 1895; H. Witsius, *Miscellanea sacra*, ii. 223–237, Amsterdam, 1700; A. Calmet, *Commentaire littéral, Jérémie*, pp. xliii.–liii., Paris, 1731; H. Schultz, *O. T. Theology*, 2 vols., London, 1892; K. Budde, *Religion of Israel to the Exile*, pp. 19 sqq., New York, 1899; R. Smend, *Alttestamentliche Religionsgeschichte*, pp. 93 sqq., Tübingen, 1899; R. Kittel, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, ii. 351–352, 385–386, Leipsic, 1909; Smith, *Rel. of Sem.*, 2d ed., 484 sqq.; Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire*, fasc. xxxiv. 1001–1003; *DB*, iv. 203–204; *EB*, iv. 4019–21; *JE*, x. 341–342.

RECLUSE (Lat. *reclusus, inclusus*): Specifically a particular kind of solitary who lives a life of seclusion in a cell (*clausa, recluserium*) in the belief that God is served by so doing. The practise became common in the West, although reports from the East concerning a temporary or permanent immurement of both male and female hermits are not lacking. Gregory of Tours (d. 593 or 594) is the first in the West to mention a number of

recluses of both sexes, and this incloistered life appears to have been widely extended in Gaul in the sixth century. Protasius lived thus at Combronde in Auvergne (*Vitæ patrum*, v.), Junianus (d. 530) at Limoges (*Gloria confessorum*, ciii.), the widow Monegundis at Tours (*Vitæ patrum*, xix.), Leobardus (d. 583) at Marmoutier near Tours, Hospitius at Vienne (*Hist. Francorum*, vi. 6), and others. Gregory further tells of the incloistration of a twelve-year-old lad, Anatolius, near Bordeaux (*Hist. Francorum*, viii. 34). He also describes (*Hist. Francorum*, vi. 29) the solemn act of immuring, in the cloister of the Holy Cross at Poitiers, during the time of St. Radegonde (d. 587). The cell being duly prepared, the Abbess Radegonde, amid the chanting of psalms, conducted the new recluse to her cell, attended by the rest of the nuns bearing lighted tapers. Here the incloistered one took leave of the nuns with a kiss, and then followed the sealing of the door. The Western Church made early provision for an ecclesiastical regulation and subjection of the incloistered religious under the church authorities. The synods of Vannes, 465 (canon vii.), Agde, 506 (canon xxxviii.), Toledo, 648 (canon v.), and Frankfort, 794 (canon xii.) decreed that permission to lead the recluse life should be given only to those who had been regularly brought up and well approved in the cloister.

The Early Recluses.

In spite of all efforts on the part of the Church to regulate the system, it retained a certain freedom and diversity. The recluses only in part affiliated with Benedictine or other cloisters; a system of lay recluses existed, independent of the orders, who in some cases annexed their cells to cloisters or to cathedral churches. Finally, there was still another class of recluses, and these must have been the least acceptable to the Church, as they lived isolated as forest and wilderness hermits, and bound themselves to no rule. The Church tolerated them, chiefly because the people venerated them for their supposed gifts of miracles and healing; but controversies concerning them were not lacking. There were recluses associated with the Benedictine cloister of St. Gall. In the ninth and tenth centuries there were also recluses in connection with other Benedictine cloisters, as at Fulda, Messobrunn, Göttweig, St. Emmeram, Nieder-Alteich, and elsewhere. Recluses were also found in the monasteries of priors obedient to the Augustinian rule, and in cloisters of the Cistercians and the Premonstrants. The most renowned unattached recluses who lived in sylvan solitude are St. Liutbirga, who dwelt in a cave of the so-called Rosstrappe, in the nether Bodethal, from about 830 to 860 (*Vita* in B. Pez, *Thesaurus anecdotorum*, ii. 146–178, 6 vols., Augsburg, 1721–1723); and St. Sisu of Drubeck in Westphalia, who inhabited her hermitage for sixty-four years (Thietmar, *Chronicon*, ix. 8).

Classes of Recluses.

Efforts to regulate the life of the solitary monks and nuns connected with cloisters were not lacking. The oldest rule was drawn up by a Frankish cloistral ecclesiastic Grimilach, probably before the close of the ninth century (L. Holstenius, *Codex regularum*, ed. M. Brockie, i. 291–344, Augsburg, 1759). It is based on the Benedictine rule, and that of Aachen dating from 817. Only monks who have passed through the cloister or secular ecclesiastics approved by strict tests, and only by permission of the bishop or abbot, are allowed to become recluses. Amid the pealing of bells, the prospective solitary enters the cell prepared for him, and the bishop seals it with his ring. The privilege of receiving daily communion is also allowed to the lay recluse. With the "contemplative life," which conjointly with the observance of the customary canonical hours obliges him to ceaseless inward prayer, he is to combine a life of action, to earn his food by manual labor, and to distribute, of his surplus, alms to the poor. This rule, again, forbids exaggerated fasting and even allows wine. Lastly, the recluse may have as many as three disciples to serve him, while the aged and infirm recluses are allowed an attendant, who also sees to their baths. There is a very compendious rule for solitaries from the Augustinian jurisdiction of Baumburg, which appears to belong to the eleventh century, and has regard chiefly to the needs of lay recluses (M. Rader, *Bavaria sancta*, iii. 114 sqq., Munich, 1624; B. Haeften, *Disquisitiones monasticæ*, p. 83, Antwerp, 1644). It gives precise directions with reference to the nature and outfit of the cell, which is to be constructed of stone, twelve feet square, with three windows, one opening into the choir of the church and serving for the reception of the communion, a second admitting food and drink, and the third, provided with glass or horn, letting in the light. Besides these rules for male recluses, there are two for women. About the middle of the twelfth century, Ethelred (d. 1166), Cistercian abbot of Revesby in the diocese of York, upon the request of his sister, a recluse, wrote a rule entitled *Aelredi regula sive institutio inclusarum* (Holstenius-Brockie, ut sup., i. 418–440). Above all he assails the symptoms of moral decline and of grievous abuses in the contemporary recluse life of England. He desires complete seclusion from the outer world, and energetically forbids the distribution of alms to the poor, and the reception of guests. His ideal is a purely contemplative life. Yet even in this respect his "Institution," like Benedictine monasticism at large, bears an aristocratic stamp. The recluse nun has in her service an old woman and a young maid, the latter attending to menial tasks. Half a century earlier is the *Ancren Riwle* ("Anchorite Rule"), composed probably by Bishop Richard Poor (d. 1237), of Salisbury (B. ten Brink, *Geschichte der englischen Litteratur*, i. 251–257, Berlin, 1877), for three noble dames living as recluse nuns at Tarrant in Dorsetshire.

Rules.

In the later Middle Ages, the solitaries were driven out by the mendicant orders and the Beguine communities (see BEGHARDS, BEGUINES). Sporadically, however, they persisted even down to the Reformation period. Leo X. conceded the same favors to four recluses of St. Andrew's Chapel in St. Peter's Church that he had accorded the Clares (Wadding, *Annales minores*, ad. 1515 n. 4). In the seventeenth century they disappeared

Decline and Disappearance.

altogether, one of the latest being Johanna of Cambry, who had herself immured as a recluse at St. Andrew's Church, Lille, in 1625, and died there in 1639 (Helyot, *Ordres monastiques*, iv. 338 sqq.).

In the Evangelical church, intense ascetic zeal urged certain Dutch Reformed extremists to restore the medieval recluse life, the best-known being the solitary Johann Gennuvit of Venningen on the Ruhr (d. 1699), who tenanted a lonely cabin (Zöckler, p. 576). G. GRÜTZMACHER.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The literature of the subject is largely bound up with that on Monasticism; special treatment may be found in: I. Hauber, *Leben und Wirken der Eingeschlossenen*, Schaffhausen, 1844; L. A. A. Pavy, *Les Recluseries*, Lyons, 1875; C. Kingsley, *The Hermits*, London, 1885; M. C. Guigue, *Recherches sur les recluseries de Lyon*, Lyons, 1887; A. Basedow, *Die Inklusen in Deutschland . . im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert*, Heidelberg, 1895; Lina Eckenstein, *Woman under Monasticism*, Cambridge, 1896; Mrs. Anna Jameson, *Legends of the Monastic Orders*, Boston, 1896; O. Zöckler, *Askese und Mönchtum*, pp. 463 sqq., Frankfort, 1897; A. W. Wishart, *Monks and Monasteries*, consult the Index under "Hermits," Trenton, 1902; *KL*, vi. 631 sqq.

RECOLLECT: The designation (from *recolligere*, "to gather again") applied to certain congregations inside different monastic orders, because their members returned to the primitive strict rule of life. So in the latter part of the sixteenth century, there were recollects of the Augustinians, and among the Franciscans there were recollects of both sexes.

(J. J. HERZOG†.)

RECONCILIATION. See ATONEMENT.

RECUSANT: The term used in the Roman Catholic and Anglican churches to denominate those who refuse (Lat. *recusare*, "to refuse") to attend church and worship after the manner of those communions.

RED CROSS SOCIETY: Henry Dunant, a native of Switzerland, having witnessed the great and unnecessary suffering of the wounded after the battle of Solferino, in 1859, and being inspired by the work of Miss Florence Nightingale (q.v.) and other women, during the Crimean War, wrote a pamphlet entitled *Un Souvenir de Solferino* (3d ed., Geneva, 1862). This work and his untiring energies aroused the interest of many of the sovereigns of Europe. In 1864, by invitation of the Swiss government, a convention of the representatives of several powers was held in Geneva, at which was signed the first treaty of Geneva, sometimes called the Red Cross treaty. This treaty was revised by a second convention in 1906, and by the Hague convention its provisions have been extended to naval warfare. It has been ratified by forty countries, representing all the civilized nations of the world (by the United States of America in Mar., 1882). This instrument provided that "officers, soldiers, and other persons officially attached to armies, who are sick or wounded shall be respected and cared for without distinctions of nationality, by the belligerent in whose power they are." Hospital formations, their personnel and supplies are neutralized and protected by the treaty, which also recognizes and includes under its provisions the volunteer aid societies of the Red Cross. Out of compliment to Switzerland, the Swiss flag, reversed in color (red cross on a white field), was selected as the universal emblem and distinctive sign for the protection provided by the treaty. The treaty provides further that all the signatory powers shall obtain, as far as possible, legislation preventing the use by private persons or by societies, other than those upon which this convention confers the right thereto, of the emblem or name of the Red Cross or Geneva Cross, particularly for commercial purposes (trade-marks).

The Treaty of Geneva.

Under the Treaty of Geneva have grown up the great national Red Cross societies of the world. Each society is organized independently and according to the customs and laws of its respective country. It must be "duly recognized and authorized" by its respective government. After a society is organized and has secured the necessary recognition by its respective government, its credentials are forwarded to the international committee at Geneva, which passes upon them. If these are found satisfactory the international committee informs the foreign office of the Swiss government, which in its turn notifies the foreign offices of all the other signatory powers of the official standing of the society. In the charter granted by congress to the American Red Cross in 1905, the reasons for the formation of an official volunteer society as stated in the act are that "The International Conference of Geneva recommends that there exist in every country a committee whose mission consists in cooperating in times of war with the hospital service of armies by all means in its powers," and that a "permanent organization is an agency needed in every nation to carry out the purposes of said treaty," and, furthermore, that "the importance of the work demands a reincorporation under government supervision." The purposes of the society "are and shall be to furnish volunteer aid to the sick and wounded of armies in time of war in accordance with the spirit and conditions of the Treaty of Geneva," "to act in matters of voluntary relief and in accord with the military and naval authorities as a medium of communication between the people of the United States of America and their army and navy, and to act in such matters between similar national societies of other governments through the international committee and the government and the people and the Army and the Navy of the United States of America." In the majority of Red Cross societies the sphere of work has been broadened to include relief after national or international disasters. In the charter of the American Red Cross the additional duty is imposed upon the society "to continue and carry on a system of national and international relief in time of peace and apply the same in mitigating the sufferings caused by pestilence, famine, fire, floods, and other great national calamities and to devise and carry on measures for preventing the same."

Red Cross Societies.

The first use of the emblem of the Red Cross in actual warfare was made by a corps of the Sanitary Commission in the last year of the Civil War in the United States of America. The volunteer societies of the Red Cross began their most active assistance

in France and Germany during the war of 1870, and since that time, in nearly all of the countries which have signed the Treaty of Geneva societies have been created.

History and Operations. The training of nurses, the organization of an active personnel that may be ready for immediate mobilization, the collecting in some countries of hospital materials, including portable barracks, hospital trains and ships, and the formation of local committees or divisions for the raising of funds and supplies, in case of war, have been among the duties of the societies. Since their organization the sufferings of the sick and wounded have been greatly decreased. This was noticeably so during the Russo-Japanese War, when the Red Cross societies of the respective countries rendered invaluable assistance, provided hospital ships, hospital trains, field hospitals, an immense amount of other supplies, and a large trained personnel for the care of the sick and wounded. The Japanese Red Cross has a membership of 1,522,000, which provides an annual income of over a million dollars. In funds this society has over seven millions of dollars and possesses property and supplies valued at a million or more. The European societies have many hundreds of thousands of members, in a number of countries the funds of the Red Cross amount to from one to five millions of dollars, and several organizations possess also large warehouses of supplies. The first organization of the Red Cross in the United States occurred in 1881, a few months before the treaty was signed by this country Its first president, Miss Clara Barton, remained at the head of the society until 1904, when she resigned. At that time it numbered about 300 members. During the war between the United States and Spain the society of which Miss Barton was president was mainly occupied in reconcentrado relief. In New York, California, and other parts of the United States independent and temporary Red Cross organizations grew up for the relief of the sick and wounded. These independent organizations died out after the war was over. In 1905 the American Red Cross was reincorporated by act of congress. Its central committee of eighteen members (the governing body) consists of six persons appointed by the president of the United States, including the chairman and representatives of the State, Treasury, War, Justice, and Navy Departments, of six elected by the incorporators, and six by the delegates from its subsidiary organizations. The law requires all accounts to be audited by the War Department and that an annual report of its transactions be made to congress. Its subsidiary organizations consist of state boards, of each of which the governor is ex-officio president, a limited number of representative citizens of the state constituting the other members. The duties of these boards lie mainly in the raising of funds in case of local disaster within the state, or of serious national and international disasters; local chapters consist of local bodies of members in counties, cities, towns, or villages, for the purpose of aiding the relief work required in time of war or disaster; there are also specialized agencies, such as duly elected charity organizations, federations of trained nurses, relief columns, and the like, for active relief work. The work of national headquarters is segregated under three boards, War, National, and International Relief. The chairman and vice-chairman of each board are members of the central committee. The duties assigned to these boards is the study, planning, organization, supervision, and control of such relief work as falls under their respective jurisdiction. From the time of its reorganization in Feb., 1905, until Jan. 1, 1910, the American Red Cross has assisted in relief work after twenty-five disasters, receiving and expending for this relief over five million dollars, besides large quantities of supplies. Not included in this amount is $400,000 raised by the sale of the Red Cross Christmas stamps to aid in the campaign against the pestilence of tuberculosis. Since the reorganization of the American National Red Cross in 1905, William Howard Taft has been the president, and the national treasurer has been the representative of the United States Treasury on the central committee, and its counselor has been the representative of the Department of Justice upon this committee.

M. T. BOARDMANN.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: C. Barton, *Story of the Red Cross*, New York, 1904; E. R. F. McCaul, *Under the Care of the Japanese War Office*, new ed., ib. 1905.

RED SEA, THE (Hebr. *Yam suph*, "Sea of Reeds"; Gk. *Eruthra thalassa*, "Red Sea"; Egyptian, *kem-ver*, "Black water"): The sea located in the Bible east of Egypt by the fact that in the exodus the Hebrews crossed it on the way to Horeb and Kadesh. The name is given in the Old Testament both to the Gulf of Suez and the Gulf of Akaba (Ex. xxiii. 31; Num. xxi. 4; Deut. ii. 1; I Kings ix. 26). It is still debated whether the Hebrew name is Semitic or a loan word (from the Egyptian *twfi*). In connection with the Exodus it is necessary to remember that in the time of the Pharaohs the western arm of this sea extended as far as Wadi Tumilat, i.e., to about the middle of the Isthmus of Suez, and that to the northern part of this arm the Egyptian name *kem-ver* was given. The Egyptians called the Red Sea below Suez "the Sea of Sailing Around." The meaning "sea of reeds" has been called in question on grounds of natural history, yet is settled by Ex. ii. 3, 5; Isa. xix. 6. Beds of reeds are still to be found in the region, though not common on the Red Sea, and the reed grows in fresh water. In attempting to account for the Greek-Roman name "Red Sea," in Jonah ii. 5, the meaning "sea grass" has been proposed for the Hebrew *suph*, and it is conjectured that the name is derived from the fact that this reddish sea growth abounds in those waters. But that name could not on this ground be applied especially to this body of water, since the growth is common to all seas, and the poem in Jonah is not particularly pertinent to the argument. No very noticeable red phenomenon is observable in the Red Sea, either of animal life, vegetation, cliffs, or coral (so C. B. Klunzinger, *Bilder aus Oberägypten*, p. 263, Stuttgart, 1877). Ebers has suggested that the name may have come from *Erythræan* ("red-skinned") inhabitants of the region. Herodotus means by "Red Sea" the Indian Ocean, and he generally

calls the Gulf of Suez the "Arabian Gulf," though he employs also the term "Red Sea." What now goes by that name, the waters from the Straits of Bab-el-Mandeb, northward to the peninsula of Sinai, has existed since the chalk age, though its area is growing less through the elevation of the land about its shores.

Upon the events related in Ex. xiii.–xv., dealing with the passage of the sea by the Hebrews who had sojourned in Egypt, some light has been thrown by the excavations carried on under the Egypt Exploration Fund (q.v.), especially the investigations in the Wadi Tumilat under E. Naville in 1883. It has been shown that a "treasure city" (Ex. i. 11) existed there of which the name was probably Pithom ("sanctuary of the god Tum"). A stone was found by Naville bearing the inscription *Ero Castra*, showing the location there of the Greek city Heroopolis, the Roman Ero Castra, which the Coptic version of Gen. xlvi. 28–29 brings into connection with Goshen in the land of Rameses and with Pithom (cf. Ex. i. 11). The Coptic translator seems to have known that Heroopolis was the site of the earlier Pithom. From Greek and Roman writers of the period 300 B.C.–150 A.D. it is known that the Red Sea reached as far as this place and was navigable. Geological evidence fully corroborates this testimony, and the recession of the waters has taken place in the present geological era. The reports of canal-building in this region by Necho II. and Darius refer doubtless to the dredging of an old channel. The stations of the Hebrews as given in the two narrations of J and P do not accord, as is shown by a parallel presentation.

J.	P.
Gen. xlv. 10 and Ex. viii. 22, "land of Goshen."	Gen. xlvii. 11, "land of Rameses"; Ex. xii. 13, "land of Egypt"; Ex. xii. 37, "Rameses to Succoth."
Ex. xiii. 17–18, "not the way of the land of the Philistines, but the way of the wilderness of the Red Sea."	Ex. xiii. 20, "Etham, in the edge of the wilderness"; Ex. xiv. 2, 9, circuit to Pi-hahiroth between Migdol and the sea, before Baal-zephon.
Ex. xv. 22, 23, 27, "wilderness of Shur," "Marah," "Elim."	Ex. xvi. 1, "Elim."

The data given by J is intelligible in the light of present knowledge. The "way of the land of the Philistines" is the old caravan route which passes by the southeast corner of the Mediterranean. The "way of the wilderness of the Red Sea" led through the Wadi Tumilat past Pithom to the region of the Bitter Lakes and the wilderness of Shur, which, according to Gen. xxv. 18, was "before Egypt," i.e., on its eastern border. Since the Hebrews were hemmed in by the border fortresses, there was no alternative but to ford the sea at a shallow spot. It would appear that the combination of a strong east wind and an ebb tide, producing a complete drying-up of the waters, was not an uncommon phenomenon. In the opportune happening of this phenomenon Moses would see the favoring hand of his God, and he led his people across during the night. The earlier construction of the passage led Moses and the Hebrews southward toward Suez; the discovery of Naville has made this hypothesis untenable. The account of P is less intelligible. For the "land of Rameses" see GOSHEN. Succoth is equated with the frequently recurring Egyptian term *Thuku* or *Thuket*, the name of a district in the region of Pithom. Etham may be the Hebrew rendering of the Egyptian *hetem*, "fortress," several of which guarded the eastern boundary of Egypt against the nomads. Ex. xiv. 2 by the use of "turn" creates a puzzle as to the location of the camp. A Migdol is known to have existed twelve Roman miles from Pelusium, somewhere near Tell al-Her, but to pass this would lead the Israelites by "the way of the Philistines," which was forbidden (J). Pihahiroth is not yet definitely made out. Present knowledge does not permit more exact following-out of the narrative of P (H. GUTHE.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: C. E. Ehrenberg, in *Abhandlungen der Berliner Akademie, physikalische Klasse*, 1832, 1, pp. 164 sqq. (on the corals); F. Fresnel, in *JA*, 6 ser., xi (1848), 274 sqq.; C. Ritter, *Comparative Geography of Palestine*, i. 56–60, 162–166, Edinburgh, 1866; G. Ebers, *Durch Gosen zum Sinai*, 91 sqq., 532 sqq., Leipsic, 1881; A. W. Thayer, *The Hebrews and the Red Sea*, Andover, 1883; W. M. Müller, *Asien und Europa*, Leipsic, 1893; E. C. A. Riehm, *Handwörterbuch des biblischen Altertums*, iii. 986–987, ib. 1894; *DB*, iv. 210; *EB*, iv. 4022–24. On the Exodus, E. Naville, *The Store City of Pithom and the Route of the Exodus*, London, 1885 (an epoch-making *Memoir* of the Egypt Exploration Fund); H. Brugsch, *Steininschrift und Bibelwort*, pp. 117 sqq., 226 sqq., Berlin, 1891; J. G. Duncan, *The Exploration of Egypt and the O. T.*, London, 1908; R. Weill, *Le Séjour des israélites au désert et le Sinai dans la relation primitive*, Paris, 1910.

REDEEMER, ORDER OF THE (*Ordo S. Salvatoris* or *S. Redemptoris*): A popular designation of several Roman Catholic orders. It is incorrectly given to the Brigittines (see BRIDGET, SAINT, OF SWEDEN), and to the Ordo de redemptione captivorum, founded by St. Peter Nolasco (see NOLASCO). With more propriety it is applied to the Redemptorists (Societas sanctissimi nostri Redemptoris) of Alfonso Maria da Liguori (q.v.), though its use here can easily lead to misunderstanding. The same is true of the name as designation for a knightly order (De sanctissimo sanguine S. Redemptoris) founded by Vincent I. of Mantua in 1608; it was confirmed by Pope Paul V., but never attained to much importance. The Greek Order of the Redeemer, founded by King Otto I. in 1833 to commemorate the liberation from the Turkish yoke, is a purely secular order of merit. Lastly, a priest of the diocese of Freiburg, J. B. Jordan by name (later called Father Francis of the Cross), founded at Rome in 1881 a Societas divini Salvatoris, devoted to the work of missions. In 1889 it was given the apostolic prefecture of Assam in the East Indies as its field of labor, and in 1895 it also undertook missionary work in South Africa.

(O. ZÖCKLER†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Heimbucher, *Orden und Kongregationen*, iii. 313, 331 sqq., 516, 518, 570–571; M. Gritzner, *Ritter- und Verdienstorden aller Kulturstaaten der Welt im 19. Jahrhundert*, Leipsic, 1893; Currier, *Religious Orders*, pp. 180 sqq., 466 sqq., 673 sqq.

REDEMPTION.

Fundamental Ideas (§ 1).
Cognate Ideas (§ 2).
Redemption in the Old Testament (§ 3).
In the New Testament (§ 4).
In the Early Church and the East (§ 5).
In the West till the Reformation (§ 6).
Reformation and Later Doctrine (§ 7).
Requirements of the Doctrine (§ 8).

The Christian religion, though not the exclusive possessor of the idea of redemption, has given to it a special definiteness and a dominant position. If the term be taken in its widest sense, as deliverance from dangers and ills in general, scarcely any religion is wholly without it. It assumes an important position, however, only when the ills in question form part of a great system against which human power is helpless. This may be carried so far that every act of the religious life is contemplated in connection with the idea of redemption, as is the case with Buddhism. The doctrine assumes a higher form when it includes or principally considers deliverance from evil. The religion of Israel shows a progressive development from a mainly eudemonistic to a mainly ethical conception; and it is of the essence of Christianity to regard redemption as primarily a deliverance from sin, upon which freedom from other ills follows as a consequence. Where a decided ethical significance is given to the term, two separate lines of thought are followed out, each connected with a separate conception of sin. On the one hand, sin is a condition which appears in the light of religion as a painful burden; on the other, it is a personal act of the will, which brings with it the consciousness of guilt. Inasmuch as to this is attached the torturing consciousness of separation from God, the desire for its removal becomes the dominant thought. The fundamental question of religion, then, is the possibility of reconciliation, while sin as a condition stands first of the ills from which man seeks deliverance. In the most developed form of an ethical redemptive religion the thought of reconciliation is thus preeminent. Such a religion has the deepest conception of sin as an offense against the moral authority of God, and the highest personally ethical idea of salvation as a relation of peace resting upon the gracious disposition of God. This being the conception which is characteristic of Christianity, it would be more fitting to consider Christianity a religion of reconciliation than of redemption, in which respect it rises far above Buddhism, which is a religion of redemption.

1. Fundamental Ideas.

It will, therefore, be well to determine the relation of the terms " redemption " and " reconciliation " or " atonement " in Christian dogmatics. The actual use is somewhat lacking in precision, largely on account of the way in which they are used in the New Testament, which employs *katallagē*, for the decisive change in the relation of man to God, through which *eirēnē*, " peace," is substituted for *echthra*, " hostile " (Rom. v. 10, 11; II Cor. v. 18–20), and deliverance from impending judgment ensues (Rom. v. 9). On the other hand, *apolutrōsis* sometimes refers to the atoning work of Christ as the ground of the forgiveness of sins (Rom. iii. 24; Eph. i. 7; Col. i. 14; Heb. ix. 15), and sometimes to the final deliverance from the pressure of conditions here (Rom. viii. 23; I Cor. i. 30; Eph. iv. 30). These passages lead to a threefold use of the word—as denoting (1) the entire saving work of Christ, the deliverance from guilt, sin, and evil; (2) the precise method which renders the forgiveness of sins possible, buying back at the price of the death of Christ; (3) the change worked in human destiny by the removal of guilt. In modern theology, despite numerous variations, the weight of usage is in favor of designating by atonement the removal of guilt (not merely of the subjective consciousness of guilt), and by redemption the breaking of the power of sin and the removal of the misery consequent upon its dominion. The former combines the ethical and religious standpoints, the latter the ethical and eudemonistic (see Atonement).

2. Cognate Ideas.

If the idea of redemption be traced through the Scriptures, the belief in Yahweh's redeeming power and purpose is met at the threshold of the national existence of Israel. This existence is established by the redemption of the people from Egyptian slavery, which remains the memorial of their election as the people of God, and the pledge of further deliverances to come. The Jewish idea of redemption is originally political; the object of redemption is the nation, and the foes from whom they are redeemed are national adversaries. In the same form the idea appears after the exile. The subject of Isa. xl.–lxvi. is the redeeming acts of Yahweh, past and future, and all the prophets point to his demonstrated faithfulness as a ground for hope. But with the exile the hope took a new and more spiritual shape. The national misfortunes impressed the people deeply with the conditional nature of the covenant. Israel's guilt separates the people from its God, and only repentance can open the way to new salvation. If God restores his people, it is a sign that he forgives them and takes away their guilt. This forgiveness is based upon the free love of God; it is not gained by the sacrifices of the law, but he regards the sacrifice of his servant, upon whom is laid the iniquity of all. Thus is reached, at the highest point of the Old-Testament doctrine of redemption, the idea of an atonement which is not conditioned upon legal sacrifices and not limited to minor transgressions. Political aspirations are not lacking even here; but the fundamental idea is that of a moral change in the people (Isa. lviii. 6–14). Sin is now recognized as the root of evil, and victory is promised, not merely over national foes, but over man's hereditary enemy, the tempter. But a redemption with moral conditions can no longer be confined to one race; Israel's light is to go out to the heathen. And with this broadening of the conception comes also its individualizing; the individual who trusts in God is to be redeemed by God's intervention from peril and oppression, and even acquires a hope of resurrection from death.

3. Redemption in the Old Testament.

The form assumed in the New Testament by the

idea of redemption is not the logical continuance of this process, but is the result of the revelation of God in Christ. Though the redeemer does not correspond to the expectations of a mighty ruler of David's line, the deeds of healing and help that he performs, and the fatherly love of God that he attests, proclaim him the heaven-sent savior. He himself regards his casting-out of devils as a sign of the opening of a new period of salvation, of the coming of the kingdom of God. Finally he gives his life a ransom for many, making possible a remission of guilt by his voluntary bearing of its consequence. His appearances after his resurrection convince his disciples that he is still to be with them, as the head of his invisible kingdom, to the end of the world. His proclamation of a second coming, upon which are to follow the messianic judgment, the liberation of his people from all oppression, and a change in all the conditions of human life (Matt. xix. 28), does not alter the fact that redemption in its fullest sense is the work of his first coming. Accordingly, in the apostolic preaching the main points are the death of Christ as the basis of the atonement, his resurrection as the ground of a new and spiritual life for his disciples, and his second coming, which shall remove the oppression of evil. In other words, the New-Testament conception of redemption puts first the idea of relief from guilt, next that of deliverance from the power of sin, and last the removal of evil. Such a religious-ethical redemption can of course be limited to no one nation, but begins to realize itself wherever faith in the redeemer is present and an entrance into his world-wide kingdom is gained.

4. In the New Testament.

In Christian theology the doctrine of redemption has a different history from that of the atonement. While in the latter is concentrated the struggle to balance the religious and the ethical elements in the idea of salvation, the certainty of redemption is always a fixed background of the Christian consciousness; and the historical development is chiefly interesting for the way in which the recognition of the personal ethical nature of salvation, sharply emphasized by Paul but early obscured, came gradually into full light once more.

The idea of redemption entertained by primitive Christianity is predominantly eschatological. The believers feel themselves strangers in the world, the destruction of which is at hand, and await their blessedness in the approaching messianic kingdom. The Redeemer has indeed brought to his people knowledge and life (Didache, ix., x.); but the latter is more an object of hope than an actual experience; forgiveness of sins is connected with moral change and fulfilment of the new law. The Hellenic conception of the Christian message by the apologists brought prominently forward the knowledge imparted by Christ, who, as the perfect teacher, shows the way to "incorruption" by giving his disciples power to overcome evil spirits and walk in the path of moral purity. This intellectual-moral conception of redemption, typically represented by Justin, had a long life in the Eastern Church, but only a subsidiary influence The development of dogma was determined by the mystic-realistic conception, as worked out by Irenæus in Pauline phraseology. For him, too, immortality is the goal, which is brought about by an entire reconstruction of humanity on a higher plane; humanity is placed once more in the right relation to God and receives again his image and a share in his own immortality. Irenæus touches on reconciliation, but lays most stress on the removal of death. How little Greek theology, with its lack of a deep consciousness of guilt, was qualified to develop the latter may be seen in Origen, for whom the teaching office of Christ is still central. The treatise of Athanasius on the incarnation approaches more closely to the idea of reconciliation than does Irenæus; but even in him the leading ideas are the restoration of the true knowledge of God by the life, and the abolition of death by the death of Christ. A special place is held in eastern doctrine by the notion that the death of Christ was a purchase-price paid to the devil for the setting free of man, who had fallen into his power. This idea, wide-spread in the East, is supported by Origen and Gregory of Nyssa, while Gregory Nazianzen and John of Damascus repudiate it; in the West it was accepted by Ambrose, Augustine, Leo I., and Gregory I. At bottom only an extension of the common Greek idea of liberation from pagan ignorance and the dominion of death, it yet shows consciousness of the need of an equitable basis for the redemption, and leads up to the juristic theories developed in the West.

5. In the Early Church and the East.

Western writers were led by their realization of sin as guilt to regard the removal of guilt as the principal feature in the work of redemption. Even as early as Tertullian and Cyprian, it was interpreted in legal terms; and before long there grew up the conception of a legal satisfaction made by Christ to God. This begins with Cyprian and is carried on by Hilary and Ambrose. Augustine takes the legal view in conjunction with a mystical doctrine of salvation, and thus weakens it to some extent. For him redemption is a change in the religious-ethical state, involving freedom from the devil's power and a progressive repletion with divine strength. He has in his mind a personal relation of peace with God, but this aspect of salvation he does not carry out to definite dogmatic conclusions. The juristic idea of western theology was further developed by Anselm, who did not, however, succeed in deducing from the remission of sin an interior change in the sinner. The formal juristic treatment does not penetrate the depths of the religious-ethical process. Anselm's theory, therefore, called out an opposing theory from Abelard, resting wholly on the love of God, and was accepted by later medieval theologians only with modifications and additions. Thomas Aquinas regards as the results of Christ's sufferings the forgiveness of sins, deliverance from the power of the devil, the removal of the penalty of sin, reconciliation, and the opening of the gates of heaven. He connects the ideas of reconciliation and redemption, but makes "remission of blame" less important than "infusion of grace" and the consequent ethical movement of the will. The historical redeeming work

6. In the West till the Reformation.

of Christ is presented only as a distant condition precedent to salvation, the actual accomplishment of which follows on the supplying of grace through the medium of the Church. Although mysticism attempted to satisfy the craving for redemption partly by evasion of the Church's mediation and partly by pressing it into the service of the inner life, it failed to reach a personal ethical conception of redemption, because it placed the ethical and mystical union with God above the remission of sin.

7. Reformation and Later Doctrine.

Luther, on the other hand, made the remission of guilt accomplished by Christ's intervention the fundamental principle. The holy sufferer bears the wrath of God and satisfies his justice; but he is also the mighty conqueror who delivers us from our tyrants—the law, sin, death, the devil, and hell—and so abolishes, with sin and guilt, all the powers of evil whose dominion was founded by the fall of man. His great conception was only partially adopted by Protestant dogmatics. Melanchthon merely developed the notion of legal atonement as a necessary condition of forensic justification. Osiander was unable to bring out clearly the relation between the objective fact of redemption and the subjective justification. The more the doctrine of redemption was dominated by the idea of satisfaction, the less was it possible to include in a dogmatic system the whole train of salutary consequences which Luther connected with it. The doctrine of the royal office of the exalted savior gave the most room for them; but it considered redemption as but supplementary to the historical work of salvation. In opposition to this, Pietism, with its special interest in sanctification and in eschatology, paid great attention to the doctrine of redemption. Rationalism, with its hard morality, lost all understanding of the remission of sin and thus of redemption. Kant's deeper moral conception came near postulating this grace for the eradication of evil; but his fixed principle of moral autonomy caused him to reduce what for him was the symbolic language of dogma to interior moral processes. Schleiermacher taught his followers to recognize the central point of the Christian faith; but his optimistic conception of sin as an inevitable stage in human development, his half-pantheistic idea of God, and his naturalistic-esthetic notion of the religious and moral life prevented him from fully realizing the Christian doctrine of redemption. The newer dogmatic writers have in great part striven to recover more fully the Scriptural and the Reformation conceptions of the subject.

8. Requirements of the Doctrine.

It is essential to the completeness of the Christian doctrine of salvation that it should teach not only a reconciliation of man with God but a redemption as well, which transforms the whole life of the redeemed and their relation to the world. Redemption in its inmost, religious sense is reconciliation, the change in man's relation to God by the removal of the guilt of sin. Redemption in its ethical and its eschatological meanings is the consequence of this. But the close connection of these elements can be preserved only when the atonement is regarded as the pledge and the beginning of a new development for humanity. The believer, his sins forgiven, is transplanted with his risen Lord into the supernatural kingdom of God; the dominion of sin is broken forever in him; the source of his life is not in this world but in that which is above. Such a redemption carries with it the abolition of evil, which is already, so far as it is the positive penalty of sin, removed with sin. The common ills of life are no longer penalties to the believer, since they can not harm his relation to God. Even death has to the Christian no longer the character of a punishment, since his real life already belongs to the other world. The entire removal of evil is hindered partly by the results of past sins, partly by the coexistence in the world of those who reject salvation. The older Protestant dogmatics, therefore, in harmony with the New Testament, looked for the conclusion of the process of salvation to follow upon the second coming of Christ. Modern writers, inclining to dispute the universal connection of evil with sin, and looking with Schleiermacher for a merely subjective conquest of it, do not feel justified in including a positive abolition of evil in the idea of redemption. But the hope is inseparable from Christian belief that God will create new surroundings for the new life of his children, which shall correspond to their higher nature and allow it to develop freely and fully. In this connection with redemption lies the real foundation of Christian eschatology. (O. Kirn.)

Bibliography: The literature under Atonement (particularly the works of Baur and Ritschl); the treatises on the history of doctrine (see Doctrine, History of, especially the works of Harnack, Seeberg, Loofs, and Shedd); the subject is explicitly or implicitly discussed in all works on systematic theology (see Dogma, Dogmatics for full list of titles), which often add lists of literature; and, for the Biblical side, the principal treatises named in and under Biblical Theology (especially the works by Oehler, Schultz, Duff, Dillmann, Charles, Davidson, Bennett, Holtzmann, Stevens, Weiss, and Beyschlag). Consult further: E. Colet, *Practical Discourse of God's Sovereignty*, London, 1673, reissue, Philadelphia, 1854; T. Wintle, *Expediency, Prediction, and Accomplishment of the Christian Redemption Illustrated*, Oxford, 1794; J. Goodwin, *Redemption Redeemed*, London, 1651, reissue, 1840; C. Beecher, *Redeemer and Redeemed*, Boston, 1864; R. W. Monsell, *The Religion of Redemption*, London, 1866; H. Wallace, *Representative Responsibility . Divine Procedure in Providence and Redemption*, Edinburgh, 1867; J. G. Wilson, *Redemption in Prophecy*, Philadelphia, 1885; C. Graham, *The Glory of God in Redemption*, London, 1892; J. Orr, *Christian View of God and the World*, pp. 333 sqq., Edinburgh, 1893; A. Titius, *Die neutestamentliche Lehre von der Seligkeit*, vols. i.–iv., Freiburg, 1895–1900; W. Shirley, *Redemption According to Eternal Purpose*, London, 1902; G. A. F. Ecklin, *Erlösung und Versöhnung*, Basel, 1903; R. Herrmann, *Erlösung*, Tübingen, 1905; D. W. Simon, *The Redemption of Man*, 2d ed., Edinburgh, 1906; *DB*, iv. 210–211; *DCG*, ii. 475–484.

REDEMPTORISTS. See Liguori, Alfonso Maria di, and the Redemptorist Order.

REDEN, rê'den, FREDERICA, COUNTESS OF: German philanthropist; b. at Brunswick May 12, 1774; d. at Erdmannsdorf (a village near Schmiedeberg, 31 m. s.s.w. of Liegnitz) May 14, 1854. In 1802 she married Count Reden, who, like herself, though humanitarian in ideal, was then devoid of special religious interests. The establishment of the Prussian Bible society in 1814, however, led him to found the Buchwald society in the following year

and to make his wife its president. After the count's death in 1815, she came into contact with the Moravians, for whom she entertained the highest esteem; she was also led to preside at private devotional meetings which were almost sectarian in character. In 1837 the countess was the prime mover in the settlement of the Zillerthalers (q.v.) near Erdmannsdorf and in providing for their instruction in Protestantism, even though she was confronted by opposition and discouragement. The closing decade and a half of the life of the countess of Reden was devoted chiefly to her Bible society and to the new edition of the Hirschberg Bible (Hirschberg, 1844; see BIBLES, ANNOTATED, AND BIBLE SUMMARIES, I., 5), which, under the patronage of Frederick William IV of Prussia, was destined to replace the rationalistic *Schullehrerbibel* of Gustav Friedrich Dinter (q.v.).

(OTTO DIBELIUS.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: E. F. Reuss, *Friederike, Gräfin von Reden*, Berlin, 1888; E. Gebhardt, *Gräfin Friederike von Reden*, Diesdorf, 1906; *ADB*, xxvii. 513.

REDENBACHER, rê'den-bāH''er, **CHRISTIAN WILHELM ADOLF:** Bavarian Lutheran, conspicuous for his rigid Protestant position; b. at Pappenheim (37 m. s.w. of Nuremberg) July 12, 1800; d. at Dornhausen (a village in the valley of the Altmühl) July 14, 1876. He was educated at Erlangen (1819–23), and after five years of work as a private tutor and vicar became, in 1828, pastor at the village of Jochsberg. Here he was a sturdy opponent of rationalism, particularly in the columns of the *Homiletisch-liturgisches Korrespondenzblatt*, and he became known as a writer of popular devotional works also. Redenbacher achieved his chief fame, however, by his public remonstrance, while pastor at Sulzkirchen, against the order of the Bavarian ministry of war requiring all soldiers, including Protestants, to genuflect to the blessed sacrament when carried in procession (see KNEELING CONTROVERSY IN BAVARIA). In 1841 he declared such acts on the part of Protestants to be idolatrous, and in the following year he advocated open defiance of the order. In Oct., 1843, he was summoned before the military court at Nuremberg, and in January he was suspended for disturbing the peace by misuse of religion. He now retired to Nuremberg to await the outcome of his trial, and in Mar., 1845, was sentenced by the supreme court to a year's imprisonment. Such excitement had now been aroused among the Protestants, however, that the king remitted Redenbacher's imprisonment, although he still remained suspended. In 1846 the sympathy felt for Redenbacher outside of Bavaria resulted in his call to the pastorate of Sachsenburg in Saxony. Here he resumed literary activity, vigorously opposing the freethinking and revolutionary tendencies surrounding him. Meanwhile conditions had so changed in Bavaria that Redenbacher could accept a call, in 1852, to the pastorate of Grosshaslach, where he remained until 1860, when he was called to Dornhausen, holding the latter pastorate until his death.

The principal works of Redenbacher were: *Wahrheit und Liebe* (Nuremberg, 1842); *Simon von Cana* (1842; these two being his protests against genuflection); *Christliches Allerlei* (4 vols., Nuremberg, 1844–76); *Einfache Betrachtungen, das Ganze der Heilslehre umfassend* (2 vols., 1844–45); *Das Lichtfreundthum* (Dresden, 1846); *Geschichtliche Zeugnisse für den Glauben* (2 vols., Dresden and Calw, 1846–69); *Kurze Reformationsgeschichte* (Calw, 1856); *Lesebuch der Weltgeschichte* (3 vols., 1860–1867); *Betrachtungen bei Leichengängnissen* (Ansbach, 1869); *Evangelienpostille* (Schweinfurt, 1876); and the posthumous *Epistelpostille* (ed. by his son, T. Redenbacher, with a brief biographical sketch; Erlangen, 1878). He likewise edited the *Neueste Volksbibliothek* (7 vols., Dresden, 1847–53), and collected many of his own contributions in his *Volks- und Jugendschriften* (6 vols., Schweinfurt, 1871–75).

(E. DORN.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *Worte der Erinnerung an C. W A. Redenbacher*, Ansbach, 1876; F. Reuter, *Die Erlanger Burschenschaft 1816–33*, Erlangen, 1896; E. Dorn, in *Beiträge zur bayerischen Kirchengeschichte*, v. 1–2 (1898); Bachmann, in *Monatsschrift für Innere Mission*, June, 1900; *ADB*, xxvii. 516–518.

REDPATH, HENRY ADENEY: Church of England; b. at Forest Hill, London, June 19, 1848; d. in London Sept. 24, 1908. He was educated at Queen's College, Oxford (B.A., 1871), and was ordered deacon in 1872 and ordained priest in 1874. He was curate of Southam (1872–75) and Luddesdown (1876–80); vicar of Wolvercote (1880–83); rector of Holwell Dorset (1883–90); and vicar of Sparsholt (1890–98); and rector of St. Dunstan-in-East, London, after 1898, also examining chaplain to the bishop of London after 1905. He was also public examiner at Oxford in 1893–94, 1898–99, and 1903, and Grinfeld lecturer on the Septuagint in the same university in 1901–05. He published *Concordance to the Septuagint* (in collaboration with E. Hatch; Oxford, 1896 sqq.) and *Christ the Fulfilment of Prophecy* (London, 1907).

REED, ANDREW: English philanthropist and Independent; b. at London Nov. 27, 1787; d. there Feb. 25, 1862. He entered Hackney College as a theological student in 1807; was ordained in 1811; was pastor of New Road Chapel, 1811–31, and of Wyclif Chapel, 1831–61. He founded the London Orphan Asylum (1813–15), the Infant Orphan Asylum (1827), Reedham, another orphan asylum (1844), an asylum for idiots (1847), and the Royal Hospital for Incurables (1855); thus establishing philanthropies at an expense of $636,600. He published *No Fiction* (2 vols., London, 1819); *Narrative of the Visit to the American Churches* (2 vols., 1836); and *Charges and Sermons* (1861). In hymnology he issued *A Supplement to Dr. Watts's Psalms and Hymns* (1817), and *The Hymn Book: Prepared from Dr. Watts's Psalms and Hymns* (1842). The latter contained twenty-seven hymns by himself, one of which was "Holy Ghost! with light divine"; and nineteen by his wife, Elizabeth Holmes before her marriage, one of which was "Oh, do not let the word depart."

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A. and C. Reed, *Memoire of the Life and Philanthropic Labours of Andrew Reed, with Selections from his Journals*, 3d ed., London, 1867 (by his sons); S. W. Duffield, *English Hymns*, p. 218, New York, 1886; Julian, *Hymnology*, pp. 953–954; *DNB*, xlvii. 388–389.

REED, RICHARD CLARK: Southern Presbyterian; b. at Harrison, Tenn., Jan. 24, 1851. He

was graduated at King College, Bristol, Tenn. (A.B., 1873), and at Union Theological Seminary, Hampden-Sidney, Va. (1876); became pastor at Charlotte Court House, Va., 1877; Franklin, Tenn., 1885; of the Second Presbyterian Church, Charlotte, N. C., in 1889; and of Woodland Street Church, Nashville, Tenn., in 1892. Since 1898 he has been professor of church history in the Presbyterian Theological Seminary at Columbia, S. C. In theology he is a conservative, "loyal to the Calvinistic system as contained in the Westminster Standards." He has written *The Gospel as Taught by Calvin* (Richmond, Va., 1896); *History of the Presbyterian Churches of the World* (Philadelphia, 1905); *John Knox, his Field and his Work* (Richmond, 1905); and *Presbyterian Doctrines* (1906).

REESE, rîs, **FREDERICK FOCKE:** Protestant Episcopal bishop of Georgia; b. at Baltimore, Md., Oct. 23, 1854. He was educated at the University of Virginia (1872–75) and Berkeley Divinity School, Middletown, Conn. (1875–76), and was ordered deacon in 1878 and advanced to the priesthood in the following year. He was minister and priest in charge of All Souls', Baltimore, as well as curate at the Church of the Ascension in the same city (1878–85), and rector of Trinity, Portsmouth, Va. (1885–90), Christ Church, Macon, Ga. (1890–1903), and Christ Church, Nashville, Tenn. (1903–08). He was a deputy to six general conventions (1892–1907), and also a trustee of the University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn. In 1908, on the division of the diocese of Georgia into the sees of Atlanta and Georgia, he was consecrated bishop of the latter.

REEVE, JOHN. See MUGGLETON, LODOWICK, AND THE MUGGLETONIANS.

THE REFORMATION.

I. Theories of the Reformation.
1. The Historical View.
2. Views Antagonistic to the Reformation.
Prelatical Assault on Reformers' Characters and Motives (§ 1).
Minimizing of Religious Element (§ 2).
II. Principles of the Reformation.
Its Basis (§ 1).
Three Principles of Protestantism (§ 2).
III. The Reformation in the Different Countries.
1. Germany.
First Period (§ 1).
From 1630 to the Thirty Years' War (§ 2).
2. Switzerland.
3. France.
4. Netherlands.
5. Bohemia.
6. Hungary.
7. Poland.
8. Scandinavia.
9. England.
10. Scotland.
11. Italy.
12. Spain.
13. The United States.

The Reformation is the historical name for the religious movement of the sixteenth century, the greatest since the introduction of Christianity. It divided the Western Church into two opposing sections, and gave rise to the various Evangelical or Protestant organizations of Christendom. It has three chief branches: the Lutheran, in Germany; the Zwinglian and Calvinistic, in Switzerland, France, Holland, and Scotland; and the Anglican, in England. Each of these branches has again become the root of other Protestant denominations, notably in England and the United States, under the fostering care of civil and religious freedom (for statistics see PROTESTANTISM, II., § 4). Protestantism has taken hold chiefly of the Germanic or Teutonic races, and is strongest in Germany, Switzerland, Scandinavia, Holland, the British Empire, and North America, and extends its missionary operations to all heathen lands.

I. Theories of the Reformation. 1. The Historical View: It was a salutary religious movement, on the one hand protesting against abuses in the Church and, on the other, involving a return to Scripture in its simple sense. It was primarily neither political, philosophical, nor literary, but religious and moral. It was not an abrupt revolution, but had its roots in the Middle Ages. There were many Reformers before the Reformation." The constant pressure in the medieval Church toward reform and liberty; the startling tracts of such pamphleteers as Marsilius of Padua (q.v.) and George of Heimburg; the long conflict between the German emperors and the popes; the reformatory councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basel; the heretical sects such as the Humiliati, Waldenses (qq.v.), and Albigenses (see MANICHEANS, II.) in France, northern Italy, and Austria; Wyclif and the Lollards in England; Huss, the Hussites, and the Bohemian Brethren (qq.v.), in Bohemia; Arnold of Brescia and Savonarola in Italy (qq.v.); the spiritualistic piety and theology of the mystics of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries; the theological writings of Wesel, Goch, and Wessel (qq.v.) in Germany and the Netherlands; [the Brethren of the Common Life (see COMMON LIFE, BRETHERN OF THE) in the Netherlands and Southern Germany]; the rise of the national languages and letters in connection with national self-consciousness; the invention of the printing-press; Humanism (q.v.) and the revival of letters and classical learning under the direction of Agricola, Reuchlin, and Erasmus (qq.v.),—all these were preparations for the Reformation. In all these and similar movements the impulse was manifesting itself in favor of a more spiritual conception of Christianity, of the devotional as opposed to the sacramental view, of the individualistic as opposed to the hierarchical, and in favor of the immediate communion of all Christians with God apart from the sacerdotal aid of the priesthood. The Evangelical churches claim a share in the inheritance of all preceding history, and own their indebtedness to the missionaries, schoolmen, fathers, confessors, and martyrs of former ages, but insist on the immediate authority of Christ and his inspired organs as final. The Reformation is related to medieval Catholicism as was the Apostolic Church to the Jewish synagogue, or the Gospel dispensation to the dispensation of the law.

2. Views Antagonistic to the Reformation: The view that the movement was a stage in the legitimate development of the Christian Church is opposed by Roman Catholic historians and by writers of the Anglo-Catholic school in the Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal Church of America. These writers treat the Reformation as a misfortune or a crime. It was a crime in that its leaders wilfully rent the unity of the Western Church. It was a misfortune in so far as it prevented the orderly growth of the Church under the conduct of its ordained hierarchy and led to a decline of the Church's influence over the nations and of Christendom in the world. The chief representatives of this view are Döllinger, in his early period before 1870, Cardinal Hergenröther, Janssen, Denifle, Nicolas Paulus, Cardinal Newman, and F. A. Gasquet (*The Eve of the Reformation*, London, 1905). Such Roman Catholic historians as Hefele and Funk give to the same view a moderate statement. The very term (*Neuerung*, "Innovation") which German Roman Catholics—Denifle, Funk, and others,—give to the Reformation at once predicates of the movement a violent rupture with the preceding history of the Church and departure from the true form of Christianity. Roman Catholic writers pursue three methods to show that the Reformation was an insalutary and violent rupture: (1) The motives and character of the Reformers themselves are assailed as irreligious and sometimes sordid. This method was applied to the Reformers in their own day or soon after their death. Luther was charged with suicide, Calvin with sodomy, and Knox with the same or other offenses. The producing cause on the continent is declared to have been the rude self-will and carnalism of Luther and in England the sensualism and monarchical pride of Henry VIII. These men, with Calvin, who is compared by Döllinger and others with Marsilius of Padua, coarsely broke with legitimate Church authority, lawlessly served their own ambitions, and deserved the title and the fate of heretics. The latest traducer of the character of the Reformers was the late Henri Denifle in his learned but intemperate *Luther und Luthertum* (2 vols., Mainz, 1904 sqq.). The assault magnifies the imperfections of the Reformers, and leaves out of sight their good qualities and their purpose to do good. It denies the statements of those who stood nearest to these men, and, as in the case of Luther, distorts into a confession of carnalism and debauchery isolated statements made by Luther himself in his own vigorous and exaggerated form of speech which probably had no references to excesses. (2) The doctrines which the Reformers promulgated are declared not only unscriptural and contrary to Church tradition but immoral. Among the first representatives of this method was Johann Eck (q.v.). There has been no more able one than Denifle. The latter in a prolonged discussion pronounces Luther's doctrine of justification by faith to be not only the mother of moral lawlessness but the outcome of Luther's carnal habits. Luther, unable and unwilling to restrain his appetites, finally gave them full rein and invented the doctrine as a cloak for his excesses. He meant to say, "one may be as immoral as he pleases, faith will save." Denifle sets over against this anomic principle the principle he ascribes to the Catholic Church of salvation through faith working by love. Love is the clement which expresses itself in obedience and conformity to the moral example of Christ. This element Luther intentionally left out. In order to make a case Denifle mangles a statement in one of Luther's sermons and then gives to the fragment an interpretation which antagonizes every principle of fair criticism. (3) The Reformation is declared to have put a brusk check upon forces of progress and betterment going on in the Church. Janssen (*History of the German People at the Close of the Middle Ages*, 12 vols., London, 1896 sqq.) has presented this view with subtlety and skill. The work produced a remarkable sensation when it appeared in German (in 1876 sqq.) and it has passed through nearly twenty editions (the last, 1896 sqq.) under the hand of Pastor. Laying stress upon educational forces which were active, upon certain economic movements in society, certain devotional tracts which appeared in Germany, etc., he confuses the reader into supposing that these disconnected rills were a great current moving toward the ocean of ecclesiastical and social reform which leaders like Gerson and Clamanges had sighed for and the great reformatory councils had labored to reach. Luther not only checked but turned back this movement of progress and in Germany started an era of social disintegration and individual lawlessness from which the Western world is still suffering. Janssen (18th ed., p. 8) distinctly traces the beneficent activity of the fifteenth century "to the doctrine of the merit of good works, taught by the Church which in that age still continued to dominate all minds." This is not the place to discuss a treatment the plausibility of which has attracted even members of the Anglican Church, but is based on insecure foundations. The theory, as handled by Janssen, ignores the hopeless corruption of the papal court at the close of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth centuries, passes by the utter failure of the Fifth Lateran Council, which adjourned a few months before Luther nailed up his theses, to set reforms on foot, and keeps out of sight the general distraction of Western Christendom. It also leaves out of account the fact that the most loyal Roman Catholic countries since the Reformation era, Austria, Spain, and South America, have been in matters of human progress and civilization far behind the Protestant parts of the world, England, North America, and Germany. Burckhardt in his *History of the Italian Renaissance* declares with no little probability that the papacy itself was saved by the Reformation.

1. Prelatical Assault on Reformers' Characters and Motives.

Another theory of recent origin goes so far as to make the religious element secondary in the Reformation or so to minimize it as to give it little importance. Thus J. A. Robinson, *Study of the Lutheran Revolt* (in *American Historical Review*, Jan., 1903), says: "The assertion that the Reformation can scarcely be called a religious revolution may prove to be an overstatement, but

there are nevertheless weighty arguments which may be adduced in favor of that conclusion."

2. Minimizing of Religious Element.

This theory involves the singular conception that the modern observer knows better what was in the minds of Luther, Calvin, and Latimer, than these men knew themselves. They were under the impression that they were moved by religious considerations and had religious ends in view, but they were mistaken. Their opponents, also, were mistaken in opposing them with arguments drawn from religion. Moreover, the vast literature produced in the age of the Reformation was written with a mistaken view of what the struggle going on meant. Lasting social, political, and economic changes followed the Reformation, and were involved in its principles, but primarily the movement was a revolt of conscience against abuses in the Church and was a reproclamation of the Gospel. Such, at any rate, was the view of the Reformers themselves.

II. Principles of the Reformation: The movement started with the practical question, How can the troubled conscience find pardon and peace, and become sure of personal salvation? It retained from the Roman Catholic system all the objective doctrines of Christianity concerning the Trinity and the divine-human character and work of Christ, in fact, all the articles of faith contained in the Apostles' and other ecumenical creeds of the early church. But it joined issue with the prevailing soteriology, that is, the application of the doctrines relating to Christianity, especially the justification of the sinner before God, the character of faith, good works, the rights of conscience, the rule of faith, and the meaning and number of the sacraments. It brought the believer into direct relation and union with Christ as the one and all-sufficient source of salvation, and set aside the doctrines of sacerdotal and saintly mediation and intercession. The Protestant goes directly to the Word of God for instruction, and to the throne of grace in his devotions; while the pious Roman Catholic consults the teaching of his church, and prefers to offer his prayers through the medium of the Virgin Mary and the saints.

1. Its Basis.

From this general principle of Evangelical freedom, and direct individual relationship of the believer to Christ, proceed the three fundamental doctrines of Protestantism—the absolute supremacy of (1) the Word and of (2) the grace of Christ, and (3) the general priesthood of believers. The first is called the formal, or, better, the objective principle; the second, the material, or, better, the subjective principle; the third may be called the social, or ecclesiastical principle. German writers emphasize the first two, but often overlook the third, which is of equal importance. (1) The objective principle proclaims the canonical Scriptures, especially the New Testament, to be the only infallible source and rule of faith and practise, and asserts the right of private interpretation of the same, in distinction from the Roman Catholic view, which declares the Bible and tradition to be co-ordinate sources and rules of faith, and makes tradition, especially the decrees of popes and councils, the only legitimate and infallible interpreter of the Bible. In its extreme form Chillingworth expressed this principle of the Reformation in the well-known formula, "The Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible, is the religion of Protestants." Protestantism, however, by no means despises or rejects church authority as such, but only subordinates it to, and measures its value by, the Bible, and believes in a progressive interpretation of the Bible through the expanding and deepening consciousness of Christendom. Hence, besides having its own symbols or standards of public doctrine, it retained all the articles of the ancient creeds and a large amount of disciplinary and ritual tradition, and rejected only those doctrines and ceremonies for which no clear warrant was found in the Bible and which seemed to contradict its letter or spirit. The Calvinistic branches of Protestantism went farther in their antagonism to the received traditions than the Lutheran and the Anglican; but all united in rejecting the authority of the pope, the meritoriousness of good works, indulgences, the worship of the Virgin, saints, and relics, the sacraments (other than baptism and the Eucharist), the dogma of transubstantiation and the sacrifice of the mass, purgatory, and prayers for the dead, auricular confession, celibacy of the clergy, the monastic system, and the use of the Latin tongue in public worship, for which the vernacular languages were substituted. (2) The subjective principle of the Reformation is justification by faith alone, or, rather, by free grace through faith operative in good works. It has reference to the personal appropriation of the Christian salvation, and aims to give all glory to Christ, by declaring that the sinner is justified before God (i.e., is aequitted of guilt, and declared righteous) solely on the ground of the all-suffieient merits of Christ as apprehended by a living faith, in opposition to the theory—then prevalent, and substantially sanctioned by the Council of Trent—which makes faith and good works coordinate sources of justification, laying the chief stress upon works. Protestantism does not depreciate good works; but it denies their value as sources or conditions of justification, and insists on them as the necessary fruits of faith, and evidence of justification. (3) The universal priesthood of believers implies the right and duty of the Christian laity not only to read the Bible in the vernacular, but also to take part in the government and all the public affairs of the Church. It is opposed to the hierarchical system, which puts the essence and authority of the Church in an exclusive priesthood, and makes ordained priests the necessary mediators between God and the people.

2. Three Principles of Protestantism.

III. The Reformation in the Different Countries.—1. Germany: The movement in Germany was directed by the genius and energy of Luther, and the learning and moderation of Melanchthon, assisted by the electors of Saxony and other princes, and sustained by the majority of the people, in spite of the opposition of the bishops and the Emperor Charles V. It started in the University of Wittenberg with a protest against the traffic in indulgences, Oct. 31, 1517.

1. First Period.

and soon spread all over Germany, which was in various ways prepared for a breach with the pope. At first Luther shrank in horror from the idea of a separation from the traditions of the past, and he attacked a few abuses, taking it for granted that the pope himself would condemn them if properly informed. But the irresistible logic of events brought him into irreconcilable conflict with the central authority of the Church. Leo X., in June, 1520, pronounced the sentence of excommunication against Luther, who, in turn, burned the bull. The Diet of Worms in 1521 added to the pope's excommunication the ban of the emperor. The bold stand of the poor monk, in the face of the combined civil and ecclesiastical powers of the age, is one of the sublimest scenes in history, and marks an epoch in the progress of freedom. The dissatisfaction with the various abuses of Rome and the desire for the free preaching of the Gospel were so extensive, that the Reformation, both in its negative and positive features, spread, in spite of the pope's bull and the emperor's ban, and gained a foothold before 1530 in the greater part of northern Germany, especially in Saxony, Brandenburg, Hesse, Pomerania, Mecklenburg, Lüneburg, Friesland, and in nearly all the free cities, as Hamburg, Lübeck, Bremen, Magdeburg, Frankfort, and Nuremberg; while in Austria, Bavaria, and along the Rhine, it was persecuted and suppressed. Among the principal causes of this rapid progress were the writings of the Reformers, Luther's German version of the Scriptures (see Bible Versions, B, VII., § 3) and Evangelical hymns, which introduced the new ideas into public worship and the hearts of the people. The Diet of Speyer in 1526 (see Speyer, Diets of) left each state to its own discretion concerning the question of reform until a general council should settle it for all, and thus sanctioned the principle of territorial independence in matters of religion which prevails in Germany to this day; each sovereignty having its own separate ecclesiastical establishment in close union with the State. The next diet of Speyer (in 1529) prohibited the further progress of the Reformation. Against this decree of the Roman Catholic majority, the Evangelical princes entered, on the ground of the Word of God, the inalienable rights of conscience, and the decree of the previous diet, the celebrated protest, dated Apr. 19, 1529, which gave rise to the name, "Protestants." The Diet of Augsburg, in 1530, where the Lutherans offered their principal confession of faith, drawn up by Melanchthon, and named after that city, threatened the Protestants with violent measures if they did not return to the old Church. Here closes the first, the heroic, and the most eventful period of the German Reformation.

2. From 1530 to the Thirty-Years' War.

The second period embraces the formation of the Protestant League of Schmalkald (see Schmalkald, Articles of) for the armed defense of Lutheranism, the various theological conferences of the two parties for an adjustment of the controversy, the death of Luther (1546), the imperial "Interims" or compromises (see Interim), and the Schmalkald War, and ends with the success of the Protestant army, under Maurice of Saxony, and the treaty of Passau, 1552, giving legal recognition to Protestants. This was confirmed at the diet of Augsburg (see Augsburg, Religious Peace of). The third period, from 1555 to 1580, is characterized by the violent internal controversies within the Lutheran Church—the Osiandrian controversy, concerning justification and sanctification (see Osiander, Andreas); the adiaphoristic, arising originally from the Interims (see Adiaphora and the Adiaphoristic Controversies, §§ 6–8); the synergistic, concerning faith and good works (see Synergism); and the crypto-Calvinistic, or sacramentarian controversy, about the real presence in the Eucharist (see Philippists). These theological disputes led to the full development and completion of the doctrinal system of Lutheranism as laid down in the *Book of Concord* (first published in 1580), which embraces all the symbolical books of that church, namely, the three ecumenical creeds; the Augsburg Confession and its Apology (q.v.), both by Melanchthon; the two Catechisms of Luther (see Luther's Two Catechisms), and the Schmalkald Articles (q.v.) drawn up by him in 1537; and the Formula of Concord (q.v.). On the other hand, the fanatical intolerance of the strict Lutheran party against the Calvinists and the moderate Lutherans (called, after their leader, Melanchthonians or Philippists) drove a large number of the latter over to the Reformed (Calvinistic) Church, especially in the Palatinate (1560), in Bremen (1561), Nassau (1582), Anhalt (1596), Hesse-Cassel (1605), and Brandenburg (1614). The German Reformed communion adopted the Heidelberg Catechism (q.v.) as their confession of faith. The sixteenth century closes the theological history of the German Reformation; but its political history was not brought to a termination until after the terrible Thirty Years' War (q.v.), by the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648 (see Westphalia, Peace of), which secured to the Lutherans and the German Reformed churches (but to no others) equal rights with the Roman Catholics within the limits of the German Empire. These two denominations, either in their separate existence, or united in one organization under the name of the Evangelical Church (as in Prussia, Baden, Württemberg, and other states, since 1817), continue the only forms of Protestantism recognized and supported by the German governments; all others being small, self-supporting "sects," nourished mostly by foreign aid (the Baptists and Methodists of England and America).

2. Switzerland: The Reformation here was contemporaneous with, but independent of, the German Reformation, and resulted in the Reformed communion as distinct from the Lutheran. In all the essential principles and doctrines, except the mode of Christ's presence in the Eucharist, the Helvetic Reformation agreed with the German; but it departed farther from the received traditions in matters of government, discipline, and worship, and aimed at a more radical moral and practical reformation of the people. It naturally divides itself into three periods: the Zwinglian, from 1516 to 1531; the Calvinistic, to the death of Calvin in 1564; and the period of Bullinger and Beza, to the close of the sixteenth century. The first belongs mainly

to the German cantons; the second, to the French; the third, to both jointly. Zwingli (q.v.) began his reformatory preaching against various abuses, at Einsiedeln, in 1516, and then, with more energy and effect, at Zürich, in 1519. At first he had the consent of the bishop of Constance, who assisted him in putting down the sale of indulgences in Switzerland; and he stood in high credit even with the papal nuncio. But a rupture occurred in 1522, when Zwingli attacked the fasts as a human invention; and many of his hearers ceased to observe them. The magistrate of Zürich appointed public disputations in Jan. and Oct., 1523, to settle the controversy. On both occasions, Zwingli, backed by the authorities and the great majority of the people, triumphed over his papal opponents. In 1526 the churches of the city and the neighboring villages were cleared of images and shrines; and a simple mode of worship was substituted for the mass. The Swiss diet (like the German) took a hostile attitude to the Reformed movement, with a respectable minority in its favor. To settle the controversy for the republic, a general theological conference was held at Baden, in the Canton Aargau, in May, 1526, with Johann Eck (q.v.), the famous antagonist of Luther, as the champion of the Roman, and Œcolampadius of the Reformed cause. The result was in form adverse, but in fact favorable, to the cause of the Reformation, which was now introduced in the majority of the cantons, at the wish of the magistrates and the people, by Œcolampadius in Basel, and by Haller in Bern, also, in part, in St. Gall, Schaffhausen, Glarus, Appenzell, Thurgau, and the Grisons; while in the French portions of Switzerland Guillaume Farel and Viret (qq.v.) prepared the way for Calvin. But the small cantons around the Lake of Lucerne, Uri, Schwytz, Unterwalden, Lucerne, and Zug, steadfastly opposed every innovation. At last it came to open war between the Reformed and Roman Catholic cantons. Zwingli's policy was overruled by the apparently more humane, but in fact more cruel and disastrous, policy of Bern, to force the poor mountaineers into measures by starvation. The Roman Catholics, resolved to maintain their rights, attacked and routed the small army of Zurich in the battle of Cappel, Oct., 1531. Zwingli, who had accompanied his flock as chaplain and patriot, met a heroic death on the field of battle; and Œcolampadius of Basel died a few weeks after. Thus the progress of the Reformation was suddenly arrested in the German portions of Switzerland, and one-third of it remains Roman Catholic to this day. But it took a new start in the western or French cantons, and rose there to a higher position than ever. Soon after this critical juncture, the great master mind of the Reformed Church—who was to carry forward, to modify, and to complete the work of Zwingli, and to rival Luther in influence—began to attract the attention of the public. John Calvin (q.v.), Frenchman by birth and education, but exiled from his native land for his faith, found a new home, in 1536, in Geneva, where Farel had prepared the way. Here he developed his extraordinary genius and energy as the greatest theologian and disciplinarian of the Reformation, and made Geneva the model church for the Reformed communion and a hospitable asylum for persecuted Protestants of every nation. His theological writings, especially the *Institutes* and *Commentaries*, exerted a formative influence on all Reformed churches and confessions of faith; while his legislative genius developed the Presbyterian form of government, which rests on the principle of ministerial equality, and of a popular representation of the congregation by lay elders. Calvin left in Theodore Beza (q.v.) a worthy successor, who, with Heinrich Bullinger (q.v.), the successor of Zwingli in Zurich, labored to the close of the sixteenth century for the consolidation of the Swiss Reformation and the spread of its principles in France, Holland, Germany, England, and Scotland.

3. France: While the Reformation in Germany and Switzerland carried with it the majority of the population, it met in France the united opposition of the court, the hierarchy, and popular sentiment, and had to work its way through severe trial and persecution. Many of the first professed Protestants were either put to death or sought safety in exile. It was only after the successful establishment of the Reformation in French Switzerland that the movement became serious in the neighboring kingdom. The first Protestant congregation was formed at Paris in 1555, and the first synod held in the same city in 1559. In 1561, at the theological conference at Poissy, Theodore Beza (q.v.) eloquently but vainly pleaded the cause of the Protestants before the dignitaries of the Roman Church, and there the name "Reformed," as an ecclesiastical designation, originated. In 1571 the general synod at La Rochelle adopted the Gallican Confession (q.v.), and a system of government and discipline essentially Calvinistic, yet modified by the peculiar circumstances of a church not in union with the State (as in Geneva), but in antagonism to it. The movement unavoidably assumed a political character, and led to a series of civil wars, which distracted France till the close of the sixteenth century. The Roman Catholic party, backed by the majority of the population, was headed by the dukes of Guise, and looked to the throne, then occupied by the house of Valois. The Protestant (or Huguenot) party, numerically weaker, but containing some of the noblest blood and best talent of France, was headed by the princes of Navarre, the next heirs to the throne. The queen-regent, Catharine, during the minority of her sons (Francis II. and Charles IX.), although decidedly Roman Catholic in sentiment, tried to keep the rival parties in check, in order to control both. But the champions of Rome took possession of Paris, while the Prince of Condé occupied Orléans. The shameless and cold-blooded massacre of the Huguenots on St. Bartholomew's Day, Aug. 24, 1572, disabled but did not annihilate the Protestant party, and the ascent to the throne of Henry of Navarre, who, after the assassination of Henry III. in 1589, became king of France as Henry IV., seemed to decide the triumph of Protestantism in France. But the Roman Catholic party, still more numerous and powerful, and supported by Spain and the pope, elected a rival head, and threatened to plunge the

country into new bloodshed. Then Henry, from political and patriotic motives, in 1593 abjured the Protestant faith in which he had been brought up, saying that " to reign is well worth a mass." At the same time he secured, in 1598, to his former associates, then numbering about 760 congregations throughout the kingdom, a legal existence and the right of the free exercise of religion, by the celebrated Edict of Nantes (see NANTES, EDICT OF). But the Reformed Church in France, after flourishing for a time, was overwhelmed with new disasters under the despotism of Richelieu, and finally the revocation of the Edict of Nantes by Louis XIV in 1685 reduced it to a " church of the desert " (see CAMISARDS; COURT, ANTOINE; RABAUT, PAUL). This survived the most cruel persecutions at home, and enriched by thousands of exiles the population of every Protestant country in Europe and America. See FRANCE; HUGUENOTS.

4. The Netherlands: Here the movement was inspired in part by Luther's works, but mostly by Reformed and Calvinistic influences from Switzerland and France. Its first martyrs, Esch and Voes, were burned at Antwerp in 1523, and celebrated by Luther in a poem. The despotic arm of Charles V and his son Philip II. resorted to the severest measures for crushing the rising spirit of religious and political liberty. The duke of Alva surpassed the persecuting heathen emperors of Rome in cruelty, and, according to Grotius, destroyed the lives of a hundred thousand Dutch Protestants during the six years of his regency (1567–73). Finally the seven northern provinces formed a federal republic, first under the leadership of William of Orange, and, after his assassination (1584), under his son Maurice, and after a long and heroic struggle accomplished their severance from the Church of Rome and the Spanish crown. The southern provinces remained Roman Catholic, and subject to Spain. The first Dutch Reformed synod was held at Dort in 1574, and in the next year the University of Leyden was founded. The Reformed Church of Holland adopted the Heidelberg Catechism, the Belgic Confession (qq.v.), and the canons of the Synod of Dort of 1618–19 (see DORT, SYNOD OF). In the Netherlands the system of Arminianism was constructed by pupils of Beza, and involved the Dutch church in long and bitter controversies (see ARMINIUS, JACOBUS, AND ARMINIANISM). Arminianism infiltrated into England in the latter part of the reign of James I. and under Laud, and was adopted by John Wesley. [Laud's anti-Augustinianism was not Arminianism but Semipelagianism of the Roman Catholic type. Wesley's was the latter blended with the old evangelical anti-Augustinianism perpetuated by the Bohemian Brethren and the Unity of the Brethren (qq.v.). A. H. N.]

5. Bohemia: Preparation was made for the Reformation here by the labors and martyrdoms of John Huss and Jerome of Prague (qq.v.). Their followers, the Hussites, would have prevailed in the wars which followed if they had not been broken up by internal dissensions between the Calixtines, the Utraquists, and Taborites. From their remnants arose the Unitas Fratrum or Bohemian Brethren (q.v.). In spite of violent persecution, they perpetuated themselves in Bohemia and Moravia. When the Reformation broke out, they sent several deputations to Luther; and many of them embraced the doctrines of the Augsburg Confession, but the majority passed to the Reformed or Calvinistic communion. During the reign of Maximilian II., there was a fair prospect of the conversion of the whole Bohemian nation; but the Thirty Years' War (q.v.) and the Counter-Reformation crushed Protestantism, and turned Bohemia into a scene of desolation. A Jesuit named Anton Koniasch (1637) boasted that he had burned over 60,000 Bohemian books, mostly Bibles. The Bohemian Brethren who had fled to Moravia became, under Count Zinzendorf's care, the nucleus of the Moravian Church (see UNITY OF THE BRETHREN). But even in Bohemia Protestantism could not be utterly annihilated, and began to raise its head when the Emperor Joseph II. issued the Edict of Toleration, Oct. 29, 1781. The revival of Czech patriotism and literature came to its aid. The fifth centenary of Huss was celebrated in Prague, 1869, marked by the publication of *Documenta Magistri Johannis Hus*, ed. F. Palacky (Prague, 1869). See AUSTRIA; BOHEMIAN BRETHREN; HUNGARY; HUSS, JOHN, HUSSITES.

6. Hungary: This country was first brought into contact with the Reformation by disciples of Luther and Melanchthon, who had studied at Wittenberg, after 1524. Ferdinand I. granted to some magnates and cities liberty of worship, and Maximilian II. (1564–76) enlarged the scope. Mátyás Biró Dévay (q.v.), the first parson and leader, was at first a Lutheran, but in his later years adopted the views of the Swiss Reformer. The Synod of Erdöd, in 1545, organized the Lutheran, and the Synod of Czenger, in 1557, the Reformed Church. Rudolph II. having suppressed religious liberty, Prince Stephen Bocskag of Transylvania, strengthened by his alliance with the Turks, reconquered by force of arms (1606) full toleration for the Lutherans and Calvinists in Hungary and Transylvania, which under his successors, Bethlen Gábor and George Rákóczy I., was confirmed by the treaties of Nikolsburg (1622) and Linz (1645). In Transylvania, Socinianism also found a refuge, and has maintained itself to this day. See HUNGARY.

7. Poland: Fugitive Bohemian Brethren, or Hussites, and the writings of the German Reformers, originated the movement in Poland. King Sigismund Augustus (1548–72) favored it, and corresponded with Calvin. The most distinguished Protestant of that country was Johannes a Lasco (q.v.), a Calvinist. A compromise between the Lutheran and Reformed parties was effected by the general synod of Sendomir (*Consensus Sendomirien-sis*), in 1570; but subsequently internal dissensions, the increase of Socinianism, and the efforts of the Jesuits blighted Protestantism in that country. The German provinces now belonging to Russia—Courland, Livonia, and Esthonia—opened the door to the Reformation, and adopted the Augsburg Confession. See POLAND.

8. Scandinavia: The Reformers of Sweden were two brothers, Olav and Lars Petri (see SWEDEN), disciples of Luther, who, after 1519, preached against

the existing state of the Church. They were aided by Lorenz Anderson (q.v.). Gustavus Vasa, who delivered the country from the Danes in 1523, favored Protestantism; and the whole country, including the bishops, followed his example. In 1527 the Reformation was legalized; and, in 1593, the Synod of Upsala confirmed and completed the work by adopting the original Augsburg Confession, to the exclusion of every other. Sweden retained the episcopal form of government in the closest union with the State. This country did great service to the cause of Protestantism in Europe through its gallant King Gustavus Adolphus, in the Thirty Years' War. In 1877 complete religious freedom was granted. Denmark became likewise an exclusively Lutheran country, with an episcopal form of State-church government, under Christian III. The new bishops received presbyterial ordination through Bugenhagen, and are therefore merely superintendents, like the bishops in the Evangelical Church of Prussia.* A diet at Copenhagen in 1536 destroyed the political power of the Roman clergy, and divided two-thirds of that church's property between the crown and the nobility. The remaining third was devoted to the new ecclesiastical organization. From Denmark, the Reformation passed over to Norway, in 1536. The archbishop of Drontheim fled with the treasures of the church to Holland; another bishop resigned; a third was imprisoned; and the lower clergy were left the choice between exile, and submission to the new order of things, which most of them preferred. Iceland, then subject to Danish rule, likewise submitted to the Danish reform. See DENMARK; NORWAY; and SWEDEN.

9. England: The struggle between the old and the new religion lasted longer in England and Scotland than on the continent, and continued in successive shocks down to the end of the seventeenth century; but it left in the end a very strong impression upon the character of the nation, and affected deeply its political and social institutions. In theology, English Protestantism was dependent upon the continental reform, especially the ideas and principles of Calvin; but it displayed greater political energy and power of organization. It was from the start a political as well as a religious movement, and hence it afforded a wider scope to the corrupting influence of selfish ambition and violent passion than the Reformation in Germany and Switzerland; but it passed, also, through severer trials and persecutions. In the English Reformation five periods may be distinguished. The first, from 1527 to 1547, witnessed the abolition of the authority of the Roman papacy under Henry VIII., the culminating deed being the passing of the Act of Supremacy, 1534, making the king "the only head on earth of the church of God called the *Anglicana ecclesia*." Henry quarreled with the pope on purely personal and selfish grounds, because the latter refused consent to his divorce from Catharine of Aragon. "The defender of the faith," a title given him by the pope for his defense of the seven sacraments against Luther, remained in doctrine and religious sentiment a Roman Catholic to the end of his life; and at his death the so-called "bloody articles"—which enjoined under the severest penalties the dogma of transubstantiation, auricular confession, private masses, and the celibacy of the priesthood—were in full force.) He punished with equal severity Protestant as well as Roman-Catholic dissenters who dared to doubt his headship of the Church of England. But, while he thus destroyed the power of the pope and of monasticism in England, a far deeper and more important movement went on among the people, under the influence of the revived traditions of Wyclif and the Lollards, the writings of the continental Reformers, and chiefly of the English version of the Scriptures (see BIBLE VERSIONS, B, IV., §§ 3–4). The second period embraces the reign of Edward VI., from 1547 to 1553, and marks the positive introduction of the Reformation. Its chief ecclesiastical agent, Cranmer, was assisted in the work by Ridley and Latimer (qq.v.), and by several Reformed divines from the continent whom he called to England, especially Butzer (q.v.) of Strasburg, who was elected professor at Cambridge, and Peter Martyr of Zurich, for some time professor at Oxford. The most important works of this period and in fact of the whole English Reformation, next to the English version of the Bible, are the Forty-two Articles of Religion (subsequently reduced to thirty-nine; see THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES), and the Book of Common Prayer (see COMMON PRAYER, BOOK OF).

The third period is the reign of Queen Mary, from 1553 to 1558, and presents the unsuccessful attempt of that queen and Cardinal Pole, archbishop of Canterbury, to restore the Roman Catholic religion and the authority of the pope. The papal interim did more to consolidate the Reformation in England than Henry, Edward, and Elizabeth. Hundreds were martyred in this short reign. Others fled to the continent, especially to Geneva, Zurich, Basel, and Frankfort, where they were hospitably received and brought into closer contact with the Reformed churches of Switzerland and Germany. The fourth period is the restoration and permanent establishment of the Anglican Reformation, during the long reign of Elizabeth (1558–1603). The Roman Catholic hierarchy was replaced by a Protestant; and the Articles of Religion, and the Common Prayer Book of the reign of Edward, were introduced again, after revision. The ecclesiastical supremacy of the crown was likewise renewed, but in a modified form; the queen refusing the title "supreme head" of the Church of England, and choosing, in its place, the less objectionable title "supreme governor." The Anglican Church, as established by Elizabeth, was semi-Roman Catholic in its form of prelatical government and liturgical worship, a sort of *via media* between Rome and Geneva. It suited the policy of the court, but was offensive to the severe school of strict Calvinists who had returned from their continental exile. The result was the prolonged conflict between Anglicanism and Puritanism in the bosom of the English

*The Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, after its separate organization, first sought episcopal ordination from Denmark; but, before the negotiations were completed an act of Parliament was passed, which empowered the Archbishop of Canterbury to ordain bishops for a foreign country.

church. The Acts of Uniformity (see UNIFORMITY, ACTS OF), requiring strict adherence to the letter of the Prayer Book in every particular without omission or addition, embittered the Puritan party and also resulted in a depletion of its numbers. After the defeat of the Armada, some Puritan representatives were put to death, while others sought religious freedom by fleeing to Holland. The fifth period begins in 1603 with the reign of James I. The unhealthy religious policy of that king and his successor Charles I. stirred the Puritan spirit of the realm, and the agitation culminated in the Westminster Assembly (q.v.), in which Puritanism had a memorable but temporary triumph. Under Charles II. (1660–85) episcopacy was reestablished. After the final overthrow of the Stuarts, who had adopted Roman Catholicism, the Dissenters secured a limited liberty by the Acts of Toleration of 1689 (see LIBERTY, RELIGIOUS; and ENGLAND, CHURCH OF).

10. Scotland: The first impulse to the Reformation in Scotland proceeded from Germany and Switzerland. Copies of the writings of the continental Reformers found their way to the far north. Among its first martyrs here were Patrick Hamilton and George Wishart (qq.v.), who spent some time on the continent and were condemned to the stake by Archbishop Beaton. The movement was carried to a successful conclusion under the guidance of John Knox (q.v.). The Parliament of 1560 formally introduced the Reformation, and adopted the First Scotch Confession, drawn up by its appointment by Knox, Spottiswoode, Row, and three others, and prohibited, under severe penalties, the exercise of Roman Catholic worship. This confession remained the law till the adoption of the Westminster Confession in 1648. In 1561 the first *Book of Discipline* was issued, and gave the new church a complete Presbyterian organization, culminating in a general assembly of ministers and elders. The mode of worship, provided for in the *Book of Our Common Order* adopted 1564, was reduced to the greatest simplicity, with a decided predominance of the didactic element. Knox followed closely the model set by the Church of Geneva, which he esteemed "the best school of Christ since the days of the apostles." When the unfortunate Mary Stuart began her reign, in Aug., 1561, she made an attempt to restore the Roman Catholic religion. But her own imprudence and the determined resistance of Knox and the nation, frustrated her plans. After her flight to England (1568), Protestantism was again declared the only religion of Scotland, and received formal, legal sanction under the regency of Murray. The second period in the Scotch Reformation includes the determined conflict between Andrew Melville (q.v.), the champion of presbytery, and James VI., who was bent upon the overthrow of the Presbyterian forms of government and worship and the introduction of episcopacy after the model in vogue in England.

11. For **Italy,** see ITALY, REFORMATION IN.

12. For **Spain,** see SPAIN, REFORMATION IN.

13. The United States: Protestantism was planted here by the first Protestant emigrants to the various colonies, from the Puritans in New England to the Dutch, Swedes, Germans, and French of the Middle colonies, and the Anglican and Huguenots of Virginia and the Carolinas. All types of the continental and the English and Scotch-Irish Reformations obtained a firm foothold before the close of the seventeenth century.

(PHILIP SCHAFF†.) D. S. SCHAFF.

The general survey of the course of the Reformation given above may be supplemented for its details by the accounts given in this work of the lives of the Reformers, greater and lesser, most of whom are mentioned in the text. The article PROTESTANTISM should also be consulted, and such other topics as CHRISTOPHER, DUKE OF WUERTTEMBERG; AUGSBURG CONFESSION AND ITS APOLOGY; AUGSBURG, RELIGIOUS PEACE OF; HEIDELBERG CATECHISM; HUGUENOTS; INNER AUSTRIA; the articles on the various confessions resulting from the Reformation, and on the colloquies and conferences held during its course.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The chief sources are the writings of the Reformers, named in the articles on them in this work. The reader is also referred to the lists of literature appended to those articles, many of the entries dealing with particular phases of the movement. On the preparation for and principles of the Reformation consult the literature under PROTESTANTISM, and: É. de Bonnechose, *Réformateurs avant la réforme*, 2 vols., Paris, 1844, 2d. ed., 1846, Eng. transl., *Reformers before the Reformation*, Edinburgh, 1851; C. Ullmann, *Reformers before the Reformation*, 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1874–77; H. Worsley, *The Dawn of the English Reformation; its Friends and its Enemies*, London, 1890; F. A. Gasquet (Roman Catholic), *The Eve of the Reformation*, New York, 1901; H. B. Workman, *Dawn of the Reformation*, London, 1901; G. Bonet-Maury, *Les Précurséurs de la réforme et de la liberté de conscience dans des pays latins du xii. siècle au xvi. siècle*, Paris, 1903; A. O. Meyer, *Studien zur Vorgeschichte der Reformation*, Munich, 1903; Schaff, *Christian Church*, v. 2, chap. v.

The **General History** of the Reformation is treated in the great works on church history, listed in CHURCH HISTORY. For the English reader the best works are: T. M. Lindsay, *The Reformation*, Edinburgh, 1882; idem, *Hist. of the Reformation*, 2 vols., ib. 1906–07; and *Cambridge Modern History*, vol. ii., New York, 1904 (contains elaborate bibliography). Consult further: D. Schenkel, *Die Reformatoren und die Reformation*, Wiesbaden, 1856; idem, *Das Wesen des Protestantismus*, 3 vols., Schaffhausen, 1862; M. de Aubigné, *Hist. de la réformation*, 5 vols., Paris, 1835–53; idem, *Hist. de la réformation au temps de Calvin*, 5 vols., ib. 1862–75 (in Eng. transl. in many editions, e.g., the two in 13 vols., New York, 1879). L. Häusser, *Geschichte des Zeitalters der Reformation*, Berlin, 1868, Eng. transl., *The Period of the Reformation*, ed. W. Oncken, Edinburgh, 1885; A. R. Pennington, *God in the History of the Reformation in Germany and England, and in the Preparation for it*, London, 1869; F. Seebohm, *Era of the Protestant Revolution*, London, 1874; M. J. Spalding (Roman Catholic), *Hist. of the Protestant Reformation*, Baltimore, 1875; K. R. Hagenbach, *History of the Reformation*, 3 vols., Edinburgh, 1880–81; A. Laugel, *La Réforme au xvi. siècle*, Paris, 1881; S. A. Swaine, *The Religious Revolution*, London, 1882; C. Beard, *The Reformation in its Relation to Modern Thought and Knowledge*, London, 1885 (able); H. Schmidt, *Handbuch der Symbolik*, Berlin, 1890; L. Koenig, *Die päpstliche Kammer unter Clemens V. und Johann XXII.*, Vienna, 1894; J. A. Babington, *The Reformation*, London, 1901; W. Walker, *The Reformation*, New York, 1901; B. J. Kidd, *The Continental Reformation*, London, 1902; A. H. Newman, *Manual of Church History*, vol. ii., Philadelphia, 1903; J. M. Stone, *Reformation and Renaissance, 1377–1610*, London, 1904; C. Beard, *The Reformation*, London, 1906; G. P. Fisher, *Hist. of the Reformation*, New York, 1906; K. von Hase, *Handbook of the Controversy with Rome*, ed. J. W. Steane, 2 vols., London, 1906; P. Whitney, *The*

Reformation; Outline of the Hist. of the Church, 1503–1648, New York, 1907; J. S. Schapiro, *Social Reform and the Reformation*, ib. 1909; H. Wace, *Principles of the Reformation, Practical and Historical*, London, 1910.

On **Germany** consult: Schaff, *Christian Church*, vol. vi (with rich and well-arranged lists of literature); J. Sleidan, *The General History of the Reformation of the Church from the Errors and Corruptions of Rome, Begun in Germany by Martin Luther 1517–56. With a Continuation to the Council of Trent 1562*, by E. Bohun, London, 1689; P. Marheinecke, *Geschichte der teutschen Reformation*, 4 vols., Berlin, 1831 (excellent, popular); C. P. Krauth, *The Conservative Reformation*, Philadelphia, 1872; A. Schmelzer, *Die deutsche Reformation*, Merseburgh, 1883; L. Keller, *Die Reformation und die älteren Reformparteien*, Leipsic, 1885; C. Beard, *Martin Luther and the Reformation in Germany until the Close of the Diet of Worms*, ed. J. F. Smith, London, 1889; F. von Bezold, *Geschichte der deutschen Reformation*, Berlin, 1890; J. P. Edmond, *Catalogue of a Collection of Fifteen Hundred Tracts by M. Luther and his Contemporaries*, London, 1903; W. Friedensburg, *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, Berlin, 1903; L. von Ranke, *History of the Reformation in Germany*, translated by S. Austin, London, 1905; W. Walther, *Für Luther wider Rom*, Halle, 1900; F. Thudichum, *Die deutsche Reformation 1517–37*, vols. i.–ii., *1517–37*, Leipsic, 1907–1909.

On **Switzerland** consult: Schaff, *Christian Church*, vol. vii (with selected lists of literature); A. Ruchat, *Hist. de la réformation de la Suisse*, 7 vols., Paris, 1835–38; A. L. Herminjard, *Correspondance des réformateurs*, 9 vols., Geneva, 1866–97; *Archiv für die schweizerische Reformations-Geschichte*, Freiburg, 1869 sqq.; J. Strickler, *Actensammlung zur schweizerischen Reformationsgeschichte*, 5 vols., Zurich, 1878–84; E. Egli, *Actensammlung zur Geschichte der Zürcher Reformation*, Zurich, 1879; *Berner Beiträge zur Geschichte der schweizerischen Reformationskirchen*, Bern, 1884; E. Issel, *Die Reformation in Konstanz*, Freiburg, 1898. Consult also A. Piaget, *Documents inédits sur la réformation dans le pays de Neuchâtel*, Neuchâtel, 1909.

For **France** the literature is given under FRANCE; and HUGUENOTS. For the **Netherlands** the literature is given under HOLLAND; REFORMED CHURCHES. Consult further: G. Brandt, *The History of the Reformation in and about the Low Countries; from the Beginning of the Eighth Century down to the Great Synod of Dort*, 4 vols., London, 1720; D. van Pelt, *A Church and her Martyrs*, Philadelphia, 1889. For **Bohemia, Hungary, and Poland,** the literature is in part given under AUSTRIA; BOHEMIAN BRETHREN. Consult further: V. Krasinski, *Sketch of the Religious History of the Slavonic Nations. Bohemia*, Edinburgh, 1851; idem, *Historical Sketch of the Reformation in Poland*, 2 vols., London, 1840; F. Palacky, *Geschichte von Böhmen*, 4 vols., Prague, 1864; O. Koniecki, *Geschichte der Reformation in Polen*, 2 vols., Breslau, 1872.

Literature on **Scandinavia** will be found under DENMARK; NORWAY; and SWEDEN. Consult further: L. A. Anjou, *History of the Reformation in Sweden*, New York, 1859; C. M. Butler, *The Reformation in Sweden*, New York, 1883; R. T. Nissen, *De nordiske Kirkers Historie*, Christiania, 1884; A. C. Bang, *Den norske Kirkes Historie, 1536–1600*, Christiania, 1895; T. B. Willson, *Hist. of Church and State in Norway*, London, 1903.

For **England and Scotland,** besides the literature under ENGLAND, CHURCH OF; and PRESBYTERIANS, consult: G. Burnet, *Hist. of the Reformation*, ed. Pocock, 7 vols., Oxford, 1865; P. Heylyn, *Ecclesia Restaurata; or, The History of the Reformation of the Church of England, with the Life of the Author*, by J. Barnard, ed. J. C. Robertson, 2 vols., London, 1849; H. Soames, *Hist. of the Reformation of the Church of England*, 4 vols., London, 1826–27; C. Geikie, *The English Reformation. How it came about, and why we should uphold it*, New York, 1879; J. H. Blunt, *The Reformation of the Church of England: its History, Principles and Results (A.D. 1514–47)*, London, 1882; W. Fitzgerald, *Lectures on Ecclesiastical History, Including the Origin and Progress of the English Reformation from Wickliffe to the Great Rebellion*, ed., W. Fitzgerald and J. Quarry. With memoir of author's life and writings, 2 vols., London, 1885; S. R. Maitland, *Essays Connected with the Reformation in England*, New York, 1889; G. Cooke, *History of the Reformation in Scotland; with an introductory Book, and an Appendix*, 3 vols., London, 1819; W. M. Hetherington, *History of the Church of Scotland, from the Introduction of Christianity to the Period of the Disruption, May 18, 1843*, 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1853; P. Lorimer, *The Scottish Reformation. A Historical Sketch*, London and Glasgow, 1860; W. Maccoll, *The Reformation Settlement*, London, 1901; F. W. Maitland, *The Anglican Settlement and the Scottish Reformation*, London, 1902; D. Hay Fleming, *The Reformation in Scotland. Its Causes, Characteristics, and Consequences*, ib. 1910.

REFORMATION, CELEBRATION OF. See FEASTS AND FESTIVALS, II., § 3.

REFORMED CATHOLICS: A small body originating in New York City about 1879. Priests of the Church of Rome, who had left that communion, formed a few congregations, chiefly in New York, and began evangelistic work on a Protestant basis of belief. The leader of the movement is Rev. James A. O'Connor, the editor of *The Converted Catholic*, New York City, which protests against features of the Roman system of doctrine, government, discipline, and practise, and teaches Protestant doctrine as understood by the Evangelical churches. Opposition to the sacramental system of the Roman Catholic Church is a pronounced feature of this body. The salvation of the believer is not dependent on his relation to the Church, but comes directly from Christ. Hence, there is no need of intermediaries or other mediators. All can come directly to God by faith in Christ, the only high priest. The Holy Spirit is the only teaching power in the Church. There are six churches, eight ministers, and about 2,000 communicants.

H. K. CARROLL.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: H. K. Carroll, *Religious Forces of the United States*, pp. 82–83, New York, 1896.

REFORMED CHRISTIAN CHURCH. See PRESBYTERIANS, VIII., 1, § 1.

REFORMED CHURCH IN AMERICA. See REFORMED (DUTCH) CHURCH, II.

REFORMED CHURCH, CHRISTIAN: A denomination which originated in Michigan in 1857 when four congregations led by Rev. K. Vanden-Bosch withdrew from the Reformed (Dutch) Church (q.v.) with which the Hollanders who had settled in western Michigan in 1847 had united in 1849. This withdrawal was caused by dissatisfaction with the teaching and practise of the Reformed Church. The True Holland Reformed Church, as the new denomination was called, increased but slowly and not without struggling until 1882, when it received a welcome accession of half a dozen Michigan congregations which had left the Reformed Church because of the refusal of its general synod to legislate against freemasonry. In 1890 the True Reformed Dutch Church located in New Jersey and New York united with the Christian Reformed Church. This body had left the Reformed Church in 1822 claiming it had become corrupt in doctrine and discipline (see REFORMED [DUTCH] CHURCH, II., 7). However, while the Christian Reformed Church (so named since 1890) originated in these secessions from the Reformed Church, the great majority of its membership never belonged to that denomination, but joined after the separations alluded to had occurred, coming direct from the Netherlands,

almost exclusively from the "Christian Reformed Church" (now "Reformed Churches") of Holland (q.v.).

Largely because of the strong emigration tide the Christian Reformed Church in America has increased very rapidly during the last two or three decades. From a mere handful of members in Michigan in 1857, it has grown into a denomination numbering, in 1910, 75,905 souls, nearly 29,000 communicants, and 193 congregations, located in nearly every one of the northern states of the Union, from ocean to ocean. In Canada also a foothold has been obtained. The church is the strongest in Michigan, Iowa, Illinois, and New Jersey. In Grand Rapids, Mich., its theological seminary and John Calvin College is located, numbering 200 students and 12 professors. This institution, started on a small scale in 1876, trained nearly all of the 140 Christian Reformed ministers now in active service. Over half a dozen of them labor in home-mission work, chiefly among the scattered Hollanders in the United States. Mission work is carried on also among the Navaho and Zuni Indians in New Mexico. Rehoboth, near Gallup, N. M., is the principal station. The Chicago Hebrew Mission is largely supported by this denomination. Most of the congregations as yet speak Dutch; half a dozen, German; about twenty use the English language exclusively, in public worship. The Psalms constitute the chief manual of praise. *The Banner*, founded in 1866 and now published in Grand Rapids, Mich., is the American weekly devoted to the church and its principles. The standards are the Belgic Confession, Heidelberg Catechism, and Canons of Dort, and to these loyal adherence is given. Members of secret societies are excluded. The government is presbyterial, based on the constitution of Dort, 1618–19. In accordance therewith each congregation is ruled by a consistory composed of elders and deacons, presided over by the pastor. Representatives of these in a given district form a classis, meeting from two to four times each year. Six delegates from each classis (at present there are twelve of these bodies) meet biennially as a synod. This synod, the highest church court, maintains fraternal relations with the stricter Calvinistic churches of America, Europe, and South Africa. The Christian Reformed Church lays much stress on catechetical instruction and house-to-house visitation, and favors Christian primary schools. Nearly all congregations maintain Sunday-schools and young people's societies.

HENRY BEETS.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *Acts and Proceedings of the Classis and General Synod of the True Reformed Protestant Dutch Church* (1822–66); B. C. Taylor, *Annals, Classis of Bergen*, New York, 1857; *Notulen, Chr. Geref. Kerk*, 1857–1910; *Brochure der Ware Holl. Geref. Kerk*, Holland, Mich., 1869; F. Hulst, *Zamenspraak*, Holland, Mich., 1874; G. K. Hemkes, *Rechtsbestaan der Holl. Chr. Geref. Kerk*, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1893; H. Vander Werp, *Outlines of the History of the Christian Reformed Church*, Holland, Mich., 1898; H. Beets, articles on Dr. S. Froeligh and Rev. K. Vanden Bosch in *Geref. Amerikaan*, 1900–02; idem, in *Journal of Presbyterian Hist. Society*, Mar., 1907, and especially in *Gedenkboek van het Viftigjarig Jubileum der Christelijke Gereformeerde Kerk, 1857–1907*, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1907.

REFORMED CISTERCIANS. See TRAPPISTS.

REFORMED COVENANTED PRESBYTERIANS. See PRESBYTERIANS, VIII., 10.

REFORMED (DUTCH) CHURCH.

I. In the Netherlands.
Events Prior to the Synod of Emden (§ 1).
The Synod of Emden (§ 2).
Results of Expulsion of the Spanish (§ 3).
Struggles Between Reformed and Roman Catholics (§ 4).
Final Organization (§ 5).
II. In America.
1. The Background.
2. First Period, 1628–64.
3. Second Period, 1664–1708.
Results of English Conquest (§ 1).
Attempts to Impose Anglican Church (§ 2).
4. Third Period, 1708–47.
5. Fourth Period, 1747–92.
6. Fifth Period, the Independent American Church, 1792–1909.
The Constitution (§ 1).
Ecclesiastical Bodies; New Growth (§ 2).
Educational Institutions (§ 3).
7. The True Reformed Church.
III. In South Africa.
1. Dutch Reformed Church in Cape Colony.
2. Dutch Reformed Church in the Orange Free State.
3. United Dutch Reformed Church in Transvaal.
4. Dutch Reformed Church of Natal.
5. Reformed Church in South Africa.
6. "Hervormde" Church of Transvaal.

I. In the Netherlands: The establishment of the Reformed Church in the Netherlands was gradually brought about despite every effort of the Roman Catholic Church to prevent it. Though for a time it seemed that sacramentarians and Anabaptists were destined to gain control, before long Reformed tenets made headway, and the triumph of Calvinism was assured. This was the condition of affairs as early as 1567, when the duke of Alva was sent to the Netherlands for the extirpation of heresy. The stern measures adopted by him rendered even secret assemblies of the Protestants full of peril, and the exodus of adherents of the new doctrines rapidly increased. England and France afforded harbors to the refugees, but their chief centers were the important cities of Emden, Wesel, Cologne, Aachen, Frankenthal, and Frankfort. The need of organization was strongly felt, and in 1571 the foundation was laid for a definite ecclesiastical system by the synod held at Emden, which marks the beginning of the Reformed Church in the Netherlands. But before this, by the creation of consistories there had been expressed the conviction that the members of each local body formed an organic whole, and provincial synods were established to bring the churches in different localities into closer union. This was perceived to be inadequate, and there developed a desire for more definite organization and for a formal statement of the unity in doctrine already prevailing. On Nov. 3, 1568, about forty preachers and elders met at Wesel, apparently under the presidency of Petrus Dathenus, to draw up a tentative church

1. Events Prior to the Synod of Emden.

order. This informal assembly, to receive official recognition, must necessarily be followed by a synod of duly qualified delegates of the various congregations, empowered to draft rules and regulations binding on the entire Dutch Reformed body. In the actual realization of this synod—that held at Emden—the leader was Marnix van St. Aldegonde (q.v.). Deeply impressed with the need of a general synod, he had devoted the period of his captivity in Germany (beginning with 1567) to the realization of his ideal. With this end in view, he seems to have written the open letter which, in 1570, was widely distributed, in the name of the congregations at Heidelberg and Frankenthal. The chief ideas advanced by Marnix in this letter were discussed at the Synod of Emden and became the bases of specific resolutions. In this letter Marnix invited the congregations to whom he wrote to delegate men to a conference to be held at Frankfort in Sept., 1570, which led up to the Synod of Emden, though a provisional synod was first held at Bedbur on July 4–5, 1571, attended by delegates from Germany and Brabant as well as from Jülich. Here the definitive synod was resolved upon, and Gerard van Kuilenburg and Willem van Zuylen van Nijevelt were empowered to confer with the congregation at Emden, and after first securing the approval of the congregations at Wesel and Cleves, they also won the sanction of the Emden Reformed. The result was that the two delegates named, together with four others, were entrusted with the preparations for the general synod.

The committee thus formed chose Emden as the place and Oct. 1, 1571, as the date on which to convene. The only opposition to the synod came, curiously enough, from Holland. The grounds for these objections are unknown, but they appear to have been regarded as trivial. The Walloon and Flemish congregations at Cologne, on the other hand, appealed to the prince of Orange to induce the Dutch Reformed to send delegates to the synod; and the synod was attended by a number of Reformed pastors from Holland. Thus the first general synod of the Dutch Reformed Church was held at Emden on Oct 4–13, 1571. The president was Gaspar van der Heyden, preacher at Frankenthal; the vice-president, Jean Taffin, pastor of the Walloon congregation at Heidelberg; and the secretary, Joannes Polyander, pastor of the Walloon congregation at Emden. The attendance was twenty-nine, five of whom were elders. This synod laid the foundations of the Dutch Reformed Church. The delegates were fully aware that they had been called to prepare binding regulations, and that they were the authorized representatives of their church. Besides adopting three of the Wesel articles (the nineteenth, twentieth, and twenty-first of the Emden articles), the synod utilized the French church order of 1559, the two often corresponding word for word. On the other hand, the Emden acts can not be considered a mere amplification of the French church order. The acts of this synod are distinctly Calvinistic, and the organization which they propose is presbyterial and synodal. The sole bond of union between churches is consensus in doctrine; fellowship is desired with the churches of other lands, provided they are Reformed in doctrine. The standards adopted were the Belgic Confession and the French; the Geneva Catechism was to be used in French congregations, and the Heidelberg Catechism in the Dutch, though churches employing any other corresponding catechism might retain it. The administration was to be conducted by consistories, classes, synods, and national synods. Of these, only the consistories were to be permanent, the members of the other bodies being chosen for each assembly. Each church or congregation was to have a consistory, consisting of preachers, elders, and deacons, and the consistory was to meet at least weekly. Every three or six months a classis " of several neighboring churches " was to meet; and synods were to be held annually of the congregations in Germany and East Frisia, of the English congregations, and of the Dutch congregations. About every two years a national synod " of all the Belgic churches together " was to be held. Each congregation, while independent, formed part of an organic whole, being subject successively to the classis, the synod, and the general synod, in each of which it was represented by delegates chosen either directly or indirectly. The synod arranged for classes in the various countries and prepared a number of regulations governing the internal administration of the Reformed congregations, as on the calling of pastors, the choice of elders and deacons, and the length of their terms, baptism, the Lord's Supper, marriage, discipline, and the like.

2. The Synod of Emden.

The next synod was to meet in the spring of 1572 in case the congregations in England should be willing and able to send deputies, otherwise it was to be postponed to the spring of the year following; and the Palatinate classis was authorized to convene it. It was, however, never held, for, though the congregations in England approved, at least in general, the decisions of the Synod of Emden, and though they desired to form classes and send delegates, they could not obtain the requisite consent of the English government. Nevertheless, deputies from England were present at the national synods of Dort (1578) and Middelburg (1581), and a conference was held at London on Aug. 28, 1599. The acts of the Emden Synod were adopted, so far as practicable, by the congregations in the Palatinate, Emden, Jülich, and Berg, and by the classes of Cologne and Wesel. Gradually, however, these congregations lost their Dutch character, and their bond with the Dutch Reformed Church was dissolved. Within six months after this synod, determined resistance to Spain had begun, and the expulsion of the Spanish from city after city was followed by a corresponding increase in the number of Dutch Reformed churches. On July 15, 1572, the States General convened at Dort, and Marnix, as the representative of the prince of Orange, demanded equal rights for Roman Catholics and Reformed, provided the former abstained from all acts of disloyalty. In the following year, however, public worship was denied the Roman Catholics, the prince of Orange went over to the Reformed

3. Results of Expulsion of the Spanish.

faith and Alva retired from the Netherlands. This unexpected change of conditions was most happy for the Reformed, especially as its organization was ready to hand. In Aug., 1572, the first synod of North Holland convened and passed a number of resolutions concerning the admission of ex-priests to the Reformed ministry, infant baptism, marriage, and funeral sermons. Of the next synod, at Hoorn, nothing is known. The third synod, held at Alkmaar in Mar., 1573, determined that subscription to the Belgic Confession should be required, and that the Heidelberg Catechism should be taught and preached. It likewise began the partition of North Holland into classes. In June, 1574, a provincial synod was held at Dort with Gaspar van der Heyden, pastor at Middelburg, as presiding officer. This synod, which was practically national, was convened by the three provinces which had expelled the Spaniards, South Holland, North Holland, and Zealand. The rulings of the Synod of Emden were, in general, approved, though it was determined that henceforth subscription should be made only to the Belgic Confession, and that the Heidelberg Catechism alone should be used and taught. No national synod was held until 1578. Meanwhile, the peace of Ghent, in 1576, had been distinctly favorable to the extension of Reformed tenets in the south of Holland, and even outside the Netherlands, in Brabant, Gelderland, Utrecht, Overyssel, and Frisia, the Reformed held open or secret services, often with the connivance or approval of the authorities. New congregations arose everywhere, and the first national synod on Dutch soil was held at Dort, June 2–18, 1578. Petrus Dathenus (q.v.) was the presiding officer, Dutch and Walloon churches were represented, and delegates were present from the classes of Holland, Zealand, East and West Flanders, the Palatinate, Cleves, England, and apparently from Gelderland. The classis of Cologne, on the other hand, refused to send deputies, holding the synod to be a private gathering. The conclusions previously reached at Emden and Dort were made the basis of a church organization harmonizing in all essentials with that of Emden. Professors of theology were required to subscribe to the Belgic Confession; the Walloon congregations, like those of Wesel and Emden, were permitted to use the Geneva Catechism, but the Dutch congregations were restricted to the Heidelberg Catechism, though the *Corte ondersoeck des gheloofs* was also permitted. Finally, a division of all Netherlandish provinces into distinct synods was proposed.

4. Struggles Between Reformed and Roman Catholics.

The peace of Ghent, though intended to promote peace between Roman Catholics and Reformed, had contented neither; and the proposed religious peace set forth by the prince of Orange on July 22, 1578, in the name of the States General, granting liberty of conscience and a limited degree of religious freedom, had no better result. In consequence there arose a separation between southern Nertherlands, where the ancient faith steadily regained ground, and northern, where Reformed tenets were spreading constantly. In Mar., 1578, John of Nassau, a decided Calvinist and brother of the prince of Orange, became stattholder of Gelderland, where the Reformed at once were predominant. Though the majority of the population were still faithful to their ancient Church, the Reformed tenets were gradually firmly planted, especially by the Arnheim preacher Johannes Fontanus (q.v.), and in Aug., 1579, the first synod was held at Arnheim, where the results of the national Synod at Dort in 1578 were supported. Roman Catholic worship was forbidden in Gelderland in 1582. Overyssel had accepted the religious peace, and by 1579 had the three classes of Zwolle, Kampen, and Deventer, the first synod of the province being held at Deventer in Feb., 1580. The peace of Ghent was accepted by Frisia in Mar., 1577, Reformed refugees poured back, and in 1580 Roman Catholic worship was forbidden, while the property of the ancient church was turned over to support Reformed preachers and teachers, and in May, 1580, the first Frisian synod convened at Sneek. In southern Netherlands, on the other hand, the Reformed cause made no progress, and on Jan. 6, 1579, the Union of Atrecht (a secret alliance between Atrecht, Henegouwen, and Douay) was formed to defend the Roman Catholic Church and the authority of the king. This was opposed by the Union of Utrecht, formed on Jan. 23, 1579, between Gelderland, Holland, Zealand, Utrecht, and Groningen. It was the work of Jan of Nassau, who led the prince of Orange to abandon his policy of reconciling the Roman Catholics and the Reformed. While ostensibly permitting each province to make its own regulations concerning religion, the practical results were, as might have been expected, prejudicial to the Roman Catholic cause. On July 26, 1581, the States General renounced allegiance to the king of Spain. It took considerable time, however, for the religious situation to become settled in all provinces. Thus, in Utrecht political and ecclesiastical conditions combined to prevent organization, nor was it until 1618 that affairs decisively changed. After the great Synod of Dort (1618–19), however, the church order there established became authoritative for all the churches of the province. In Groningen no Reformed organization could be effected until the city had been retaken from the Spaniards by Prince Maurice in 1594; but on Feb. 27, 1595, a church order was promulgated which remained in force until 1816. The first Synod of Groningen was held July 14–17, 1595. The taking of Groningen had also wrested Drenthe from the Spaniards, and, as stattholder, Count William Louis of Nassau organized the Reformed Church there, so that on Aug. 12, 1598, the first classis convened at Rolde.

5. Final Organization.

Meanwhile, there had been no cessation of national synods. At the one held at Middelburg in 1581, a *Corpus disciplinæ* was drawn up, based on the articles of the Dort Synod of 1578. At the national synod held at The Hague in 1586 a church order was drawn up which, though little different from the one formulated at Middelburg, made concessions to the desire of the civil authorities to share in ecclesiastical administration. Holland, Zealand, Gelderland, and Overyssel accepted the

church order. The church orders of the other Netherlandish provinces were in harmony, except for minor details, with that formulated by the Synod of The Hague. This latter synod had done all in its power to unite all the Reformed churches of the Netherlands into an organic whole; and its church order, essentially the same as that of Emden, remained the basis for the organization and administration of the Dutch Reformed Church. Thus was the Reformed Church founded in the Netherlands. Its doctrinal standards were the Belgic Confession and the Heidelberg Catechism; it possessed an admirable system of organization; it was divided into classes and synods which met regularly and carefully guarded its interests; its consistories contributed more and more to orderly conditions of the congregations; and while at first there was a dearth of preachers, this was remedied by the universities of Leyden (1575), Franeker (1585), and Groningen (1614). It enjoyed the protection and the financial support of the State, even though entire harmony in administration and doctrine did not prevail. Its Calvinistic character was assailed by the Remonstrants (q.v.), but by their condemnation and expulsion by the national Synod of Dort in 1618–19 its true nature was vindicated, and the unity begun at Emden and completed at The Hague was powerfully strengthened. For statistics and present status see Holland. (S. D. van Veen.)

II. In America: 1. The Background: The Reformed Church in America, known until 1867 as the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church, is a body of Christians in the United States composed originally of settlers from the Netherlands, but now greatly intermixed with elements from other sources. In the Netherlands the Reformation met with a hearty welcome. Entering first from Germany, it subsequently received its great impulse from Switzerland and France, whence its distinct type of Reformed doctrine, and its more democratic Presbyterian polity. In the Netherlands, as elsewhere, there had been a great preparation made by Reformers before the Reformation. Reference can be made only to Geert Groote (q.v.) and his Brotherhood of the Common Life (see Common Life, Brethren of the). They studied the Bible and preached and prayed in the vernacular. The Bible was translated into Dutch as early as 1477 (copies of this old version are in the Lenox Library and the library of the Collegiate Church, New York). The monks, John Esch and Henry Voes, for their Evangelical preaching were burned at Brussels as early as 1523, and were, perhaps, the first martyrs of the Reformation. The Reformed Church of the Netherlands began its more formal existence in 1566, when the so-called "League of Beggars" was formed. Field preaching and the singing of evangelical hymns rapidly spread the Reformed doctrine. During the next two decades were held the conventions or synods which formulated a liturgy and rules of church government (see I., above).

2. First Period, 1628–64: The Dutch first came to America for purposes of trade. The West India Company was chartered in 1621, and settled many thousands of Dutch and Walloons in New York and New Jersey. After religious services had been conducted for five years, 1623–28, by Sebastian Jansen Krol, a comforter of the sick (Van Rensselaer-Bowier MSS., page 302), the First Church of New Amsterdam was organized by Domine Jonas Michaelius in 1628, who was its pastor for not less than four years. This is now the strong and wealthy organization known as the Collegiate Church of New York City, with its half-score of churches or chapels and fourteen ministers. The West India Company formally established the Church of Holland in New Netherland and maintained the ministers, schoolmasters, and comforters of the sick. Calls upon ministers were not valid unless endorsed by the company. In 1624 the Synod of North Holland decreed that any classis, within whose bounds either of the two great commercial companies had their chambers or offices, might take charge of all ecclesiastical interests in such colonies as were under the care of that office (*Ecclesiastical Records of New York*, i. 38). Thus the classis of Amsterdam came to have charge of the churches in New Netherland. During the government of the West India Company, or until the English conquest in 1664, fourteen churches had been established, chiefly along the Hudson and on Long Island, but including one in Delaware, and one at St. Thomas, in the West Indies (Corwin, *Manual*, p. 1073, ed. of 1902); and sixteen ministers had been commissioned for these fields. There were seven Dutch ministers in service at the time of the surrender of the Dutch colonies to the British in 1664 (Corwin, *Manual*, p. 1045).

3. Second Period, 1664–1708: During this period occurred the struggle of the church to maintain her ecclesiastical independence under English rule. At the conquest there were about 10,000 Hollanders in the colony, but Dutch immigration then practically ceased. The relation of the Dutch churches to the Classis of Amsterdam was somewhat modified by the change of political sovereignty and the destruction of their relation to the West India Company. It was a question whether these churches could survive under such circumstances. Although helped to a trifling extent at first, they were soon thrown for support on their own resources. The Dutch had, indeed, secured at the surrender liberty to worship according to their own customs and usages. But, while still under the ecclesiastical care of the Classis of Amsterdam, they were now subjects of the British empire, yet they did not legally come under the class of English dissenters. During the first decade under English rule, the English population being yet very small, there was not much opportunity for friction with the English governors. But after the revolt of the Dutch in 1673, and their re-surrender to the English by treaty of the Netherlands government in 1674, although it was stipulated that the former freedom of worship and discipline was to be maintained (*Eccl. Records of New York*, i. 662–663, 669–672), preliminary but unsuccessful efforts began to be made to impose the Church of England upon the Dutch colony. For in 1675 Governor Andros attempted to force the Rev. Nicholas Van Rensselaer (son of the first Dutch patroon of that name, one who had been, indeed, licensed to preach by the Classis of Amsterdam, but

1. Results of English Conquest.

had been ordained as a minister of the Church of England, and who was therefore a Dutch Episcopalian) upon the Dutch church of Albany, and also to allow him to intrude his services upon the Dutch church of New York. But he was stoutly resisted in these attempts and not allowed to officiate until he had subscribed to the regulations of the Church of Holland (*Eccl. Records of New York*, i. 649, 650, 678–690; Corwin, *Manual*, pp. 51, 844, 850). In 1679 the four Dutch ministers then in the country, at the request of this same Governor Andros, organized themselves into a classis, and ordained Petrus Tesschenmaker, a licentiate of the University of Utrecht, to the ministry, to supply the pressing need, and this act was subsequently approved by the Classis of Amsterdam (*Eccl. Records of New York*, ii. 724–735, 737, 739); but when directed by Governor Nicholson, in 1709, to ordain Van Vleck as chaplain to certain Dutch troops, the ministers of that period refused to obey (*Eccl. Records of New York*, iii. 1760).

With renewed persecutions in France, many Huguenots began to flock to America about 1680, who naturally fell into the fold of the Dutch Church. During the reign of Charles II., 1660–85, and of James II., 1685–88, full liberty of conscience was ostensibly granted to all denominations in America, but this was done with the sinister object of gaining entrance for Romanism. The outcome was the severe legislation of the colony of New York in 1700, altogether prohibiting Romanism under severe penalties, so that that system was virtually extinct in New York until the American Revolution. In 1682, Domine Selyns, who had left the country at the surrender in 1664, returned, and exerted a great influence in delivering the Dutch Church from governmental interference. The unfortunate complications brought about by the Leisler episode, 1689–91, put the Dutch ministers for a time in a false position, as if they opposed the accession of William and Mary. This was not by any means the case, but they only desired that changes in New York should be made in a legal manner. But with the return of the Protestant succession, the normal policy of the English government was restored, and determined and persistent efforts were made to impose the Church of England upon New York, although the population was overwhelmingly Dutch. The public commissions of the governors were liberal in spirit for those times, respecting religion, but they had secret instructions looking toward an English Church establishment. Hence, after two years' efforts, the passage of the so-called Ministry Act of 1693 was secured. The intention of the government in seeking this act, was to establish the Church of England over the whole colony; but when finally enacted it was found to cover only four counties out of ten, namely, New York, Westchester, Queens, and Richmond. Also the Church of England was not even alluded to in the act, but only that Protestant ministers should be supported by a system of taxation in these four counties. Neither would the assembly yield to the governor's wish for an amendment to give him the right to induct all ministers. And when the governor falsely assumed that this act established the Church of England, the assembly declared by resolution the contrary; that a dissenter could be called and supported under the provisions of the act; that it was entirely unsectarian. But the Dutch Church of New York City saw her danger and resolved to protect herself by a charter. This was finally secured in 1696, but not without overcoming great difficulties. Besides securing thereby their growing property and the other usual legal rights, it gave them complete ecclesiastical independence. They could call and induct their own ministers in their own way, and manage all their own church affairs without any interference from the civil authorities. And following this example and having this precedent, many of the other Dutch churches also obtained similar charters, although these were repeatedly denied to the churches of all other denominations, except the Church of England, down to the Revolution. Trinity Church obtained its charter in 1697, in which it is often declared that the Church of England is "now established by our laws," referring to the act of 1693; but as is evident, there is nothing in that act to sustain the assertion (cf. a comparison of these two earliest church charters, printed side by side in *Eccl. Records of New York*, ii. 1136–65; Corwin, *Manual*, pp. 78–85). The English Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, organized in 1701, sent over a number of English clergymen to provide for the services of the Church of England in the colonies and to teach the Indians. These missionaries expected to be supported by the provisions of this act, but lawsuits followed instead, and no income was derived from the act for nine years. Meantime the oppressions of Governor Cornbury drove a large number of Dutch families into New Jersey, 1702–10, where they settled on the banks of the Raritan and its tributaries, and this territory was for a century and a half considered the "garden of the Dutch Church." During this period, and notwithstanding the struggle for their rights, the Dutch churches increased from fourteen to thirty-one, and twenty-five ministers in all officiated.

2. Attempts to Impose Anglican Church.

4. Third Period, 1708–1747: This may be termed the period of spiritual awakening and efforts for American ecclesiastical organization. During this period many Palatines arrived and settled chiefly on the upper Hudson and along the Mohawk. In course of time about twenty German churches were organized, which came also generally under the supervision of the Classis of Amsterdam. It was a time of comparative peace—of the "Great Awakening," as it was called. Whitefield aroused the people throughout the land, while Bertholf and Frelinghuysen were the evangelists of the Dutch Church, especially in New Jersey. The necessity of more ministers was deeply felt, but few were willing to leave the Fatherland to come to America. The expense and danger of sending American youth to Holland for education and ordination were very great. Joseph Morgan, a Presbyterian, served several of the Dutch churches, 1709–31, in Monmouth County, N. J., while John Van Driessen went to Yale College for ordination in 1727 In 1729 the Classis of Amsterdam permitted the ministers in

New York City, in their name, to ordain John Philip Boehme for service among the Germans in Pennsylvania; while Haeghoort and Erickson were permitted to ordain John Schuyler for service in Schoharie County, New York. Several ordinations which were deemed irregular also occurred, to satisfy the great demand for ministers. The Frelinghuysens therefore proposed that some sort of ecclesiastical assembly should be established in America, and also urged the necessity of institutions in which to prepare young men for the ministry. In 1737, accordingly, the first formal move was made to organize an assembly, which they styled a coetus. There were three times as many churches as pastors. Three-fourths of a century had passed since the English conquest, and the ties which bound them to the Fatherland were becoming weakened. In 1738 the plan of a coetus was sent to Holland for approval. Differences of opinion prevailed on each side of the ocean, and a long delay ensued. Meantime the Classis of Amsterdam was honorably engaged in correspondence, seeking to bind together the Dutch, the Germans of Pennsylvania, and the Presbyterians, 1743, in one ecclesiastical assembly, but the effort was not successful. At length, when the appeal of the German churches was answered by the Synods of North and South Holland in the sending over of Rev. Michael Schlatter, 1746, with several ministers to organize the Pennsylvania Germans into a coetus, the Classis of Amsterdam could no longer resist the appeal of the Dutch of New York and New Jersey, and a coetus of each body was organized in 1747. About forty ministers began their labors during this period, and about forty-four new churches were organized.

5. Fourth Period, 1747–1792: This was the period of organization and ecclesiastical independence. The desired results, however, were only attained after considerable debate and strife, and all the plans were modified in their development by the entire change wrought in civil affairs by the Revolution. During the seven years of the undivided coetus, 1747–54, efforts were made to supply the churches with ministers. Only three, however, were ordained by the coetus, while six passed by that body, and went to Holland for ordination. Eight ministers were sent from Europe. Nine new churches were organized. It was, therefore, soon discovered that the coetus, as constituted, was an inefficient body. It could not license or ordain without special permission in each case, and the classis now appeared to be jealous of its own prerogative. Neither could the coetus finally determine cases of discipline. Appeals could be carried to Holland. This caused endless delays and vexations. Hence in 1753 the coetus proposed to transform itself into a classis and assume all the authority of the same. This was accomplished in the following year. But with this transaction a secession of some of the more conservative members took place, who styled themselves a Conferentie, but claimed to be the true and original coetus. They also had possession of the records. The principal points of discussion were the right and propriety of independent American ecclesiastical bodies and American institutions of learning. The personal ambition of one of the members of the Conferentie led that body finally to become willing to unite with King's (Columbia) College, to secure educational advantages therefrom; but the American classis feared the influence of an Episcopal college, and moreover could not approve the means by which that institution had obtained its charter in 1754, and especially of the manner in which a professorship of divinity for the Dutch in that institution had been secured in 1755 (*Eccl. Records of New York*, vol. v.; many documents and letters between pages 3338 and 3526, cf. summaries of same in Table of Contents, vol. v., pages xiv.–xxvii.). Ten years later, in 1764, the Conferentie formally organized into an "Assembly Surbordinate to the Classis of Amsterdam." The American classis, after several ineffectual attempts, secured a charter from the governor of New Jersey, 1766, for Queen's College, to be located in that state. An amended charter was secured in 1770. This, with several amendments, is the present charter of Rutgers College, New Brunswick, N. J. In 1771 the two parties united on certain articles of union, which granted substantially, but in somewhat obscure terms, all that the American classis of 1754 had contended for, including the organization of a general body (equivalent to a particular synod in most respects), and five special bodies (equivalent to classes in most respects). The power of licensing and ordaining was now given to this general body. A happy and speedy consummation seemed within reach, as brethren on each side gave up many cherished convictions for the sake of peace. A theological professor would have been quickly appointed, when the breaking-out of the Revolution delayed everything for a decade. The Dutch churches suffered especially during the war, which was largely on their territory; but with peace and civil liberty came to all denominations ecclesiastical autonomy, with all that it involved—independent organizations, a new sense of responsibility, literary and theological institutions, with benevolent boards for the increase of Christ's kingdom at home and its dissemination to the ends of the earth. In 1784 the names of synods and classes, denied before, were assumed by the bodies constituted in 1771 without further ceremony, and the Classis of Amsterdam was simply informed of the fact. In 1788, at a general convention, it was declared that the constitution of a church must contain its standards of doctrine, its modes of worship, and its forms of government. A committee was appointed to translate into English the standards of doctrine, the liturgy, and the rules of church order of the Church of Holland, omitting all that belonged in government to a state church; and to add explanatory articles to adapt the former rules to American circumstances. This was accomplished in 1792, and the volume containing all this was issued in 1793. Thus was the organization of the church completed. During this period, 1754 to 1792, there were added to the church ninety-one ministers and sixty-six churches.

6. Fifth Period, the Independent American Church, 1792-1910: As to the constitution, the standards of doctrine have remained unchanged. As to the liturgy: additional offices have from

time to time been added, but these, with much else in the liturgy, are considered only as specimens, and are optional as to use. Only the sacramental and ordination forms are obligatory. Abridgments of the sacramental forms were adopted in 1905, and the use of either the longer or shorter forms is permitted. Revised ordination forms were adopted in 1906. As to the rules of church government, the original articles of 1619 and the explanatory articles of 1792 were fused together in 1833, with such additions as the experience of forty years suggested. In 1867, after a prolonged discussion, the name or title of the Church was amended from "The Reformed Protestant Dutch Church in North America" to "The Reformed Church in America." In 1874, the rules of church government, popularly known as the constitution, were again revised, and various amendments to them have been adopted since.

1. The Constitution.

The rules of 1792 provided for a general synod. This body held its first session in June, 1794. Triennial sessions were held until 1812, when they were made annual. At first, all the ministers and an elder from each church formed its constituency; but in 1812 it became a representative body. In 1819 it was incorporated under the laws of New York, and is the legal trustee for all endowments for theological professorships and the real estate pertaining to its theological seminaries; also for the moneys of the "Widows' Fund"; of the "Disabled Ministers' Fund"; of some of the scholarships, and of some of the missionary moneys of the Church. These funds and other properties are managed by a board of direction, whose members are appointed by the general synod. The income of the synod was limited in 1819 to $10,000; in 1869 an act was passed allowing $15,000 more; and in 1889, by a general act, all corporations organized for benevolent purposes are permitted to hold property to the amount of $2,000,000. The provisional general body of 1771, which assumed the name of Synod in 1784, became a particular synod in 1793, under the new constitution. This body was divided into the two particular synods of New York and Albany in 1800, to which were added the particular synod of Chicago in 1856, and the particular synod of New Brunswick in 1869. The classes have increased from 5 in 1792 to 36 in 1910; the churches from about 100 in 1792 to 700 in 1910. The number of ministers did not equal the number of churches until 1845, when there were 375 of each. In 1846 began a new Dutch immigration which settled in the Middle West, but is now penetrating even to the Pacific coast and to Texas. Most of these newcomers came into the fold of the old Dutch Church, and there are now about 250 churches from this source, and as many ministers. In 1910 the Reformed Church in America reports about 700 churches, 740 ministers, 65,000 families, and 117,000 communicants, with about the same number of children in the Sunday-schools. Nearly half a million dollars are reported as given to benevolent objects, and more than a million and a half for congregational purposes. Churches exist in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin, Indiana, Illinois, the two Dakotas, Minnesota, Kansas, Nebraska, Montana, South Carolina, Oklahoma, and Washington. The denomination has beer especially successful on the foreign mission field, in India, China, Japan, and Arabia, having sent out about 225 missionaries, male and female. In 1902 the wonderfully successful Classis of Arcot, India, with 25 regularly organized churches, many of them having native pastors, was formally transferred in the interests of church union to the synod of South India, of the South Indian United Church. The missions in China and Japan are working in hearty union with the missions of other denominations.

2. Ecclesiastical Bodies; New Growth.

The history of Rutgers College at New Brunswick, N. J., has often been written. First chartered in 1766, it received an amended charter in 1770. In 1825 its name was changed from Queen's to Rutgers College, in connection with which is a scientific school leading to the degree of bachelor of science. On the 4th of April of the same year, New Jersey made it "The State College for the Benefit of Agriculture and the Mechanic Arts." By an act of Mar. 2, 1888, the United States associated with such state college a department known as "The Agricultural Experiment Station." A theological seminary also exists at New Brunswick dating back to 1784. Its history was elaborately written at its centennial in 1884. It is well equipped in all departments. Its Sage Library contains about 50,000 volumes. Hope College and the Western Theological Seminary are located at Holland, Mich.

3. Educational Institutions.

7. The True Reformed Dutch Church: This institution was formed by the secession of Rev. Solomon Froeligh with four suspended ministers in 1822, giving as their reasons, "errors in doctrine and looseness of discipline." It was in fact the culmination of an old feud that had started two or three generations before. In 1830 they attained to the number of 30 congregations and 10 ministers. By 1860 the congregations had decreased to 16, and in 1890 the feeble remnant joined "The Christian Reformed Church" (see Reformed Church, Christian).

E. T. Corwin.

III. In South Africa.—1. Dutch Reformed Church in Cape Colony: This is the oldest and largest of the Protestant denominations in South Africa. It was founded practically when the Dutch East India Company formed its first permanent settlement at Capetown under Commander J. A. Van Riebeek, Apr. 6, 1652, though the first regular minister was Rev. Johan van Arckel, who arrived in 1665 [in 1685 another was placed at what is now Stellenbosch]. In 1688, 200 Huguenot refugees sent by the Netherland authorities considerably strengthened the settlement and church [a grant of land being made at Drachenstein and the locality becoming known as "French Mountain"]. The French fellow believers after one or two generations thoroughly assimilated with the Dutch. A few new congregations were formed in the vicinity of Capetown. The pastors of these struggling churches were paid and practically controlled by the company, although

they were under the ecclesiastical supervision of the Classis of Amsterdam, which ordained and sent the ministers. The creed was of course the same as that of the mother church. At first the Psalms were sung exclusively, but since the beginning of the nineteenth century the Dutch "Evangelical hymns" are used. From 1795 until 1802 and again since 1806 the English took the place of the Dutch East India Company and controlled the church. About 1822 several Scotch ministers came to help the Holland churches, which at that time were fourteen in number. The first synod met in 1824, but this body was entirely dependent upon the government until 1842, when more liberty was obtained. In 1849 the official organ of the Dutch Reformed Church, *De Kerkbode*, was started. In 1859 the Theological Seminary at Stellenbosch opened its doors, its purpose being to prevent the entrance of rationalistic ministers from the Dutch universities, who for a season threatened the orthodoxy of the church. At present it has a faculty of four professors. Through the labors of Rev. Andrew Murray the Cape Colony church extended beyond the Orange and Vaal rivers among the kinsmen who had moved northward with the "great trek" of 1836. But in 1862 objections made against the representation of the Free State and Transvaal congregations in synod led to a legal decision which compelled these latter to assume a separate existence (see below). At present the Cape Colony church numbers about 150 congregations, some of them in Rhodesia and Mashonaland, with 116,000 members and 270,000 adherents. These churches are grouped in thirteen "rings" or presbyteries. The highest church-court, the synod, is composed of the pastors and one elder from each congregation, and meets triennially in Capetown.

Mission work is carried on among the natives of Cape Colony and the South African protectorates; over fifty "mission churches" have been organized, most of which have been grouped into "rings" and also form a synod. The actions of these bodies are controlled by the Home Mission Committee of the Cape church. In Wellington and Worcester are training-schools for missionaries and other Christian workers. The Capetown School of the Dutch Reformed Church was opened in 1878 for the education of teachers. An institution for the mute and blind, also denominational, is located in Worcester. Several other philanthropic societies are supported and a number of Bible societies are actively at work. Nearly every congregation has a Christian Endeavor Society. The church is imbibing much of the spirit of the British churches, although trying to remain Calvinistic.

2. The Dutch Reformed Church in the Orange Free State: This organization became independent in 1862. It now numbers forty-two churches, forming five "rings." The synod meets triennially in Bloemfontein. There are nearly 100,000 adherents, and 45,000 communicants. It carries on a fine home mission work in ten mission churches and supports flourishing stations in Nyassaland and northeastern Rhodesia.

3. United Dutch Reformed Church in Transvaal: This denomination is likewise an offshoot of the Cape Colony church, and originated under similar circumstances as the Orange Free State sister body. Originally called The Dutch Reformed Church, it took its present name "Nether Dutch Hervormd or Reformed Church," from a union consummated in 1885 with a number of congregations of the Dutch "Hervormde" Church of Transvaal (see below). It is composed of five "rings," and its synod meets triennially in Pretoria. It numbers 42 congregations, 85,000 adherents, and 38,000 members. Connected with it are 8 mission churches among the natives. The official organ is *De Vereeniging*.

4. Dutch Reformed Church of Natal: This is the smallest of the Dutch Reformed churches in South Africa. It has but one higher church court, the General Church Assembly, composed of the ministers and two delegates from each consistory. Its history is very much the same as that of its sister churches in Transvaal and the Orange River Colony. It numbers 4,258 adherents and 2,052 members, forming 5 congregations.

The Dutch Reformed Churches mentioned above formed in 1906 a federal council, which is bringing them nearer again to their original united condition. This council is composed of the four officers of the Cape Colony synod and ten other members, and the general synodical committees of the other bodies. In 1909 it decided to unite the four churches of Cape Colony, Free State, Transvaal, and Natal in one general synod composed of all ministers in active service and one elder from each congregation. The number of the clergymen of these four churches is nearly 300; ordained missionaries, 100; 240 congregations, and about 220,000 members. The internal government is regulated by *Wetten en Bepalingen*, in eleven chapters.

5. The Reformed Church in South Africa: This denomination originated on Feb. 10, 1859, in Rustenburg in Transvaal. It is composed of the most conservative of the Dutch Boers, frequently called "doppers," a corruption of the Dutch word *domper*, "a man intellectually behind the times." These conservatives lived in the outlying districts of the Cape Colony, and many of them formed the "great trek." Rev. D. Postma was sent to them by the Christian Reformed Church of the Netherlands in 1858. Under his guidance they left the Dutch Reformed Church, mainly because of their opposition to the use of the evangelical hymns, and also because of the liberal spirit of some of the Dutch Reformed pastors at the time. Postma organized congregations in Transvaal, the Orange State, and the Cape Colony.

The statistics for 1909 are as follows: in the Transvaal 24 churches with 11 ministers, 7,400 communicants, 8,233 baptized members, 15,633 adherents. In the Orange Free State 12 churches, with 7 ministers, 2,934 communicants, 3,051 baptized members, 5,985 adherents. In Cape Colony 17 churches with 13 ministers, 4,853 communicants, 5,204 baptized members, 10,057 adherents. Most churches having a pastor have two services on Sabbath; during one of these services a Lord's Day of the Heidelberg Catechism is explained. Vacant charges usually meet on one Sunday of each month, and every quarter they have services led by ministers. Every Sunday, except during the quarterly com-

munion services, those who live too far away from the church hold meetings in private homes, led by the elders of the several districts. The church is supported by voluntary contributions of the members. The official organ of the church is *Het Kerkblad*, a monthly. The spirit of the denomination is strictly Calvinistic, in harmony with the three doctrinal standards of all Reformed Churches of Holland origin. The leaders of this church are largely influenced by the writings of Drs. Kuyper and Bavinck of the Netherland Reformed churches. The theological school of the denomination was opened in 1869 in Burghersdorp, Cape Colony, and since 1905 is located in Potchefstroom. Its faculty consists of four professors. This church more and more realizes the need of mission work, and is carrying it on in a few places within and without its domain. The Church Order of Dordrecht forms the basis of the church government.

6. "Hervormde" Church of the Transvaal: This church is composed of Reformed Dutch people who followed Rev. D. Van der Hoff, who at first, in 1856, had joined the Dutch Reformed Church of the Cape Colony, but later on seceded because he considered that church too rigidly Calvinistic. The Hervormde Church is very much akin to the State Church in the Netherlands, being quite rationalistic in its doctrines and loose in its discipline. It numbers 21 churches, with about 10,000 members. Its general assembly is composed of the ministers, one-half of the eldership of each congregation, and two deacons of each consistory, and meets biennially.

HENRY BEETS.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: For the Netherlands consult: I. Le Long, *Kort historisch Verhaal van de Oorsprung der Ned. Gereformeerde Kerken onder 't Cruis*, Amsterdam, 1751; J. J. Altmeyer, *Les Précurseurs de la réforme aux Pays Bas*, 2 vols., Paris, 1856; C. Hooijer, *Oude Kerkordeningen der Ned. Herv. Gemeenten (1563–1638)*, Zaltbommel, 1865; J. Knappert, *De nederlandsche Hervormde Kerk*, Leyden, 1883; M. G. Hansen, *Reformed Church in the Netherlands*, New York, 1884; J. Gloel, *Hollands kirchliches Leben*, Wittenberg, 1885; H. J. M. Everts, *Onze Kerken*, 's Bosch-Zwoller, 1887; H. G. Kleyn, *Algemeene Kerk en Plaatselijke Gemeente*, Dordrecht, 1888; W. H. de S. Lohman, *De Kerkgebouwen van de Gereformeerde-Hervormde-Kerk*, Amsterdam, 1888; J. I. Good, *Rambles round Reformed Lands*, Reading, Pa., 1889; J. H. Gunning, *Het Protestantsche Nederland onzer dagen*, Groningen, 1889; F. L. Rutgers, *Acta van de Ned. Synoden der zestiende Eeuw*, The Hague, 1889; idem, *De Geldigheid van de oude Kerkenordening der Ned. Gereformeerde Kerken*, Amsterdam, 1890; J. H. Gunning, *Opmerking en over het liturgische Element in den Gereformeerden Cultus*, Groningen, 1890; Boehl, *Prolegomena voor eene gereformeerde Dogmatiek*, Amsterdam, 1892; P. J. Muller, *Handboek der dogmatiek, ten dienste der Ned. Hervormde Kerk*, Groningen, 1895; W. E. Griffis, *Brave Little Holland and What she Taught us*, Boston, 1894; and the literature under HOLLAND.

For the church in America as sources consult: *Minutes of the Coetus, 1737–71*, of the *Provisional Synod, 1771–1793*, of the *General Synod, 1794 sqq.* (official); *Constitution of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church*, New York, 1793 (republished as needed); *Documentary History of New York*, 4 vols., Albany, 1850–51; *Documents Relating to the Colonial Hist. of New York*, 14 vols., Albany, 1856–1883; *Magazine of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church*, 4 vols., 1827–30; A. Gunn, *Memoir of Rev. John H. Livingston*, New York, 1829, 2d ed., 1856; J. K. Brodhead, *Hist. of the State of New York*, 2 vols., New York, 1853–71; E. B. O'Callaghan, *New Netherland*, 2 vols., New York, 1855; *Ecclesiastical Records of the State of New York*, 6 vols., Albany, 1901–05. On the history consult: D. D. Demarest, *Hist. and Characteristics of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church*, New York, 1856, 2d ed., with title, *The Reformed Church in America. Its Origin, Development, and Characteristics*, 1889; E. T. Corwin, *Manual of the Reformed Dutch Church*, New York, 1859, 4th ed., 1902; idem, in *American Church History Series*, vol. viii., ib. 1895 (both volumes contain indispensable lists of literature); W. B. Sprague, *Annals of the American Pulpit*, vol. ix., New York, 1869; *Centennial Celebration of Rutgers College*, Albany, 1870; J. Brinkerhoff, *Hist. of the True Reformed Dutch Church*, New York, 1873; *Centennial Discourses of the Reformed Church in America*, 2d ed., New York, 1877; *Centennial of the Theological Seminary, New Brunswick, N. J.*, New York, 1885; N. H. Dosker, *De hollandsche Gereformeerde Kerk in America*, Nijmegen, 1888; *Historic Sketch of the Reformed Church in N. C.* (by a board of editors under the Classis of N. C.), Philadelphia, 1908.

For doctrine and legislation refer to: W. Hastie, *Theology of the Reformed Church in its Fundamental Principles*, New York, 1904; E. T. Corwin, *Digest of Constitutional and Synodical Legislation of the Reformed Church in America*, New York, 1906; M. J. Bosma, *Exposition of Reformed Doctrine: a popular Explanation of the most essential Teachings of the Reformed Churches*, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1907; and the literature under HEIDELBERG CATECHISM, and DORT, SYNOD OF.

On Africa: C. Spoelstra, *Van Zoeterwonde naar Pretoria*, Capetown, 1898; and the minutes (*Acta*) of the Synods.

REFORMED CISTERCIANS. See TRAPPISTS.

REFORMED (COVENANTED) PRESBYTERIANS. See PRESBYTERIANS, VIII., 10.

REFORMED EPISCOPALIANS: The Reformed Episcopal Church formally separated from the Protestant Episcopal Church, under the leadership of Bishop George David Cummins (q.v.), at a meeting composed of prominent Protestant Episcopal clergymen and laymen, held in New York Dec. 3, 1873. The cause of the separation was found in the rapid rise and advance of ritualism and of its controlling influence in the Protestant Episcopal Church. The establishment of an independent episcopal church was necessitated for the purpose of preserving the Low Church Evangelical principles and practises of the English Reformers of the sixteenth century, and of the early Protestant Episcopal Church in America, which fundamental principles and customs were becoming obliterated in the spread of the Oxford or Tractarian movement (see TRACTARIANISM) in England and in America, and in the consequent rapid and successful substitution of Roman dogma and rites for the historic and Biblical Reformed doctrine and Protestant liturgical worship of the old Reformed Church of England and of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the early days of American history. The Reformed Episcopal Church therefore claims to be the old Protestant Episcopal Church in the full meaning of the title, and takes its name from the historic title of the Reformed Church of England, and the great English Reformers and Protestant martyrs. Bishop Cummins immediately consecrated Charles Edward Cheney (q.v.) bishop of the West, now the synod of Chicago, which charge he still holds.

Origin and History.

The church in 1910 reports 5 synods and missionary jurisdictions in the United States and Canada, 94 parishes, 7 bishops, and 99 other clergy, about 10,500 communicants, about 11,000 in the Sunday-schools, a church property, free of incumbrances, valued at about $1,670,000, controls property in use, valued at about $1,835,000, and holds and is heir

to, denominational endowment funds amounting to about $350,000, not including large parochial endowments. It has a well-equipped and endowed theological seminary in Philadelphia, with an alumni roll of 64 names. It is represented in two church papers: *The Episcopal Recorder*, published weekly in Philadelphia, founded 1822, formerly a Protestant Episcopal organ; and *The Evangelical Episcopalian*, published monthly since 1888 in Chicago. The church maintains a large mission work among the colored freedmen of the South, under the care of a white superintendent An extensive foreign-mission work is conducted in India, including at Lalitpur orphanages and schools, and at Lucknow a hospital and dispensary, all under the charge of clergymen educated in the Philadelphia Theological Seminary.

The Church in America.

The church has a considerable following in England, where it was introduced in 1877, now under the episcopal jurisdiction of Bishop Philip X. Eldridge, of London. The English branch now constitutes an independent but affiliated church, and reports 28 ministers, 1,990 communicants, 6,000 sittings, and 256 teachers, and 2,600 pupils in its Sunday-schools.

The Church in England.

While the Reformed Episcopal Church perpetuates the historic church as represented in the Evangelical English Reformation, it differs from the Protestant Episcopal Church of modern days fundamentally in doctrine, as well as in ceremonial and ritual. Possessing and preserving the historic episcopate, it holds that the episcopate is not a separate order in the ministry, but is an office within the presbyterate, and that the bishop is among the presbyters *primus inter pares*. It "recognizes and adheres to episcopacy, not as of Divine right, but as a very ancient and desirable form of church polity." And it repudiates the dogma of Apostolic Succession (q.v.; see also SUCCESSION, APOSTOLIC), and "condemns and rejects" as "erroneous and strange doctrine, contrary to God's Word, that the Church of Christ exists only in one order or form of ecclesiastical polity." It recognizes the validity of all Evangelical orders, confirmed in the laying on of hands of the presbytery; and holds communion with, and exchanges pulpits with, all Evangelical Protestant Churches, and receives from them by letters dimissory, clergy and laity without reordination or reconfirmation, and dismisses to them, as to parishes in her own communion.

Doctrines and Ritual.

It denies that Christian ministers are "priests" in any ecclesiastical sense, and has eliminated this title, as so applied, from the Prayer Book. It "rejects" the "strange doctrine" that "the Lord's Table is an altar on which the oblation of the Body and Blood of Christ is offered anew to the Father," and "that the Presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper is a presence in the elements of Bread and Wine." And it forbids the erection of any such altar in the church, where may be found only the honored, historic, plain communion table. It denies "that Regeneration is inseparably connected with Baptism" of water, as taught in the old formularies, and has expurgated from the Prayer Book statements to such effect. It has adopted as the model for its Prayer Book the thoroughly Evangelical and Protestant Book of Bishop White, the first American Prayer Book of 1785, which followed the Reformed doctrinal standard of the Second Book of Edward VI. of 1552, rejecting the later American Prayer Book of 1789, and of present use in the Protestant Episcopal Church, for the assigned reason that it followed the High-church standard of the reign of Queen Elizabeth, which in turn had followed the half-reformed First Book of Edward VI. of 1552.

The Reformed Episcopal Prayer Book, retaining all the beautiful historic forms of worship, is entirely free from any germs of Roman Catholic doctrine, and, having been in constant use for thirty-seven years, is the only Low-church revision of the Prayer Book that has had a history of actual service in common use for a period of more than four years.

W. RUSSELL COLLINS.

The "Declaration of Principles" set forth at the organization of the Reformed Episcopal Church in 1873 took the following form:—

I. The Reformed Episcopal Church, holding "the faith once delivered unto the saints," declares its belief in the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the Word of God, and the sole Rule of Faith and Practice; in the Creed "commonly called the Apostles' Creed"; in the Divine institution of the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper; and in the doctrines of grace substantially as they are set forth in the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion.

II. This Church recognizes and adheres to Episcopacy, not as of divine right, but as a very ancient and desirable form of church polity.

III. This Church, retaining a Liturgy which shall not be imperative or repressive of freedom in prayer, accepts the Book of Common Prayer, as it was revised, proposed, and recommended for use by the General Convention of the Protestant-Episcopal Church, A.D. 1785, reserving full liberty to alter, abridge, enlarge, and amend the same, as may seem most conducive to the edification of the people, "provided that the substance of faith be kept entire."

IV. This Church condemns and rejects the following erroneous and strange doctrines as contrary to God's Word:

First, That the Church of Christ exists only in one order of ecclesiastical polity:

Second, That Christian Ministers are "priests" in another sense than that in which all believers are "a royal priesthood":

Third, That the Lord's Table is an altar on which the oblation of the Body and Blood of Christ is offered anew to the Father:

Fourth, That the Presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper is a presence in the elements of Bread and Wine:

Fifth, That Regeneration is inseparably connected with Baptism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Mrs. Annie D. Price, *Hist. of the Formation and Growth of the Reformed Episcopal Church 1873–1902*,

Philadelphia, 1902; B. Aycrigg, *Memories of the Reformed Episcopal Church*, New York, 1875, new ed., 1882; Mrs. G. D. Cummins, *Memoir of G. D. Cummins*, ib., 1878; C. C. Tiffany, in *American Church History Series*, vii. 534–536, New York, 1895; H. K. Carroll, in the same, i. 325, ib. 1896.

REFORMED (GERMAN) CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES.

I. History.
Period of the Coetus (§ 1).
Period of the Synod (§ 2).
Statistics and Agencies (§ 3).
II. Doctrine, Worship, and Government.

I. History: The Reformed Church (German) in the United States traces its origin back to Zwingli (q.v.) in northeastern Switzerland, who began preaching the Evangelical Gospel at Einsiedeln in 1516. These doctrines, as further developed by Bullinger and Calvin, passed over into Germany. Elector Frederick III. of the Palatinate caused the Heidelberg Catechism to be written by Ursinus and Olevianus and published it at Heidelberg Jan. 19, 1563. The founders of the church in this country were colonists from the Palatinate and other parts of western Germany and also from Switzerland. The first minister, Samuel Guldi (q.v.), came from Bern to America in 1710. The first purely German congregation was founded at Germania Ford, on the Rapidan, Va., 1714. But the first complete congregational organization took place 1725, when John Philip Boehm, a schoolmaster, organized the congregations at Falkner Swamp, Skippach, and White Marsh, Pa., according to the principles of Calvin, and adopted as standards the Heidelberg Catechism and the Canons of Dort. George Michael Weiss came in 1727 and organized the Philadelphia congregation. Boehm was ordained 1729 at New York by the Dutch Reformed ministers under the authority of the classis of Amsterdam in Holland. In 1742 Count Zinzendorf tried to unite all the German churches and sects in Pennsylvania into one organization with the Moravians as the leading body. This was opposed by Boehm and Guldi (q.v.). In 1746 Michael Schlatter (q.v.) came from St. Gall, Switzerland, commissioned by the Reformed Church of the Netherlands to organize the Germans of Pennsylvania. After traveling much among the congregations, he completed their organization, begun by Boehm, by forming the coetus at Philadelphia Sept. 29, 1747, at which there were present four ministers and representatives from twelve charges. The second coetus (1748) completed the organization by adopting as its standards the Heidelberg Catechism and the Canons of Dort. It also adopted a constitution, which was Boehm's constitution of 1725 somewhat enlarged. In 1751 Schlatter returned to Europe, traveling through Holland, Germany, and Switzerland seeking aid for the Pennsylvania churches, and returned with six young ministers appointed by the Reformed Church of the Netherlands. Some effort was made, 1741–51, toward union with the Dutch Reformed and Presbyterians, but the attempt failed. The coetus continued under the control of the Reformed Church of the Netherlands, which sent thirty-eight ministers to America and spent about $20,000 on the American churches. The actions of the coetus were reviewed by the deputies of the Synods of North and South Holland and by the classis of Amsterdam. This relation to Holland continued until 1792, when the coetus virtually declared itself independent (see Reformed [Dutch] Church, II., 3–6).

1. Period of the Coetus.

The first synod was held at Lancaster Apr. 27, 1793. The church then consisted of 22 ministers, 178 congregations, and about 15,000 members. Its first problems were the education of ministers and the change of language from German to English. After a number of conflicts as at Philadelphia and Baltimore, the latter was solved by the gradual introduction of English into the services. The former was solved by the education of young men privately by different ministers. Of these, three were especially prominent, Christian Lewis Becker of Baltimore, Samuel Helffenstein of Philadelphia, and L. F. Herman of Falkner Swamp. In 1820 the synod divided itself into classes and decided to found a theological seminary, which, however, was not opened until 1825. The Ohio classis broke off in 1824 and organized itself into an independent synod. In 1822 the free synod of Pennsylvania also broke away but returned in 1837. Similarly an independent synod was organized in Ohio in 1846, but returned about 1853. From 1829 to 1844 a revival wave spread over the church. From 1845 to 1878 was the period of controversy. In 1844 Philip Schaff (q.v.) delivered his inaugural address on "The Principle of Protestantism," which led to the formation of the Mercersburg theology. This was formulated (1847) by the publication of *The Mystical Presence* by John Williamson Nevin (q.v.) and by *What is History?* by Philip Schaff (q.v.). Soon after the Mercersburg theology appeared, a liturgical movement began at the synod of 1847. In 1857 the provisional liturgy was published. In 1863 the tercentenary of the Heidelberg Catechism was celebrated by a convention at Philadelphia, and in that year the Ohio synod united with the old synod in forming the general synod. In 1867 the order of worship was published. In 1867 the Myerstown convention was held to protest against the tendency toward ritualism in the church. This convention resulted in the founding of Ursinus College. In 1869 the western (or low-church) liturgy was published. Both the order of worship and the western liturgy were permitted by the general synod to be used, but neither was adopted constitutionally by being voted upon by the classes. The liturgical controversy continued until 1878, when the general synod appointed a peace commission, which formulated a basis of union. This commission was appointed by the next general synod (1881) to prepare a new liturgy—*The Directory of Worship*. This was finally adopted constitutionally by the general synod (1887) after the classes had voted upon it.

2. Period of the Synod.

Home-mission work was carried on by the church almost from the beginning (A. C. Whitmer, *One Hundred and Fifty Years of Home Missionary Activity*, Lancaster, 1897). Foreign missionary work was begun 1842 by the appointment of Benjamin

Schneider as missionary at Broosa, later at Aintab, in Asia Minor, under the American Board of Foreign Missions. This continued till 1866. In 1879 the first missionary was sent to Japan and in 1900 to China (cf. H. K. Miller, *History of the Japan Mission*, 1904). The church had (in 1908) 1,170 ministers, 1,681 congregations, 288,271 communicants, 1,716 Sunday-schools, 25,333 Sunday-school teachers and officers, 232,746 Sunday-school scholars, and 221 students for the ministry. The contributions for congregational expenses were $1,886,610, and for benevolence $403,779.

3. Statistics and Agencies.

The first theological school was founded at Carlisle, 1825. This was removed to York in 1829, and to Mercersburg in 1836. Its classical school, begun 1831, grew into Marshall College, 1836, removed in 1853 to Lancaster and united with Franklin College to form Franklin and Marshall College. The theological seminary was removed to Lancaster in 1871. In Ohio efforts were made to found a theological school at Canton (1838), then at Columbus (1848), but no permanent school was founded till in 1850, when Heidelberg College and Theological Seminary were founded at Tiffin, Ohio. The latter was united with Ursinus School of Theology in 1907 to form Central Theological Seminary, located at Dayton, Ohio, 1908. A German Mission house was founded in 1870 at Franklin, Wis., where there is now a college and theological seminary. Other colleges are Catawba College, Newton, N. C.; Ursinus College, Collegeville, Pa. (with theological department removed to Philadelphia, 1898–1907). Female colleges are Allentown Female College, Allentown, Pa., Woman's College, Frederick, Md., and Claremont Female College, Hickory, N. C. Preparatory schools are Mercersburg College, Mercersburg, Pa.; Massanutten Academy, Woodstock, Va., and Interior Academy, Dakota, Ill. The church has orphans' homes at Womelsdorf, Pa., Greenville, Pa. (formerly Butler, Pa.), Fort Wayne, Ind., and Crescent, N. C.; also deaconess homes at Alliance, Allentown, and Cleveland. It publishes twelve church papers in English, German, and Hungarian, and sixteen Sunday-school publications.

II. Doctrine, Worship, and Government: The Reformed Church was in language allied to the Lutheran Church, being German (although probably about three-fourths now use English at the church services). But otherwise it was allied historically with the Calvinistic family of churches and is a member of the Alliance of Reformed Churches holding the Presbyterian System. Its early ministers (1725–92) adopted the Calvinistic creeds of Holland, the Canons of Dort, and the Heidelberg Catechism. When the church became independent of Holland, it adopted as its standard only the German creed, the Heidelberg Catechism. Certain tendencies toward a diminished Calvinism appeared with even some traces of Arminianism, though the church in the main was Calvinistic. But many preferred to be called Zwinglian rather than Calvinistic. In 1840, when J. W. Nevin was called from the Presbyterian Church to be professor of theology at Mercersburg, it was looked upon as cementing the ties with the other Calvinistic churches. But the Mercersburg theology departed from the earlier system in claiming to be neither Calvinistic nor Arminian but Christocentric. It emphasized, however, what it conceived to be Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper, though this was denied by the opponents of Mercersburg theology. It was claimed for the Mercersburg theology that it held to the "spiritual real presence" while the old Reformed held to the real spiritual presence as against an imaginary presence or no presence of Christ at all at the Lord's Supper. Mercersburg theology emphasized the objective efficacy of the sacraments and also the objective in the visible Church. Within the last twenty years there has arisen a reaction against these High-church views in a more liberal school of theology, the leader of which was the late William Rupp of the Lancaster Theological Seminary, which is inclined toward Broad-church positions. On worship the church has been semi-liturgical, that is, its Sabbath worship was free, but its services for sacraments, marriage, and ordinations were prescribed in a liturgy. For over a century the Palatinate liturgy was used by the ministers. No liturgy was officially published by the synod till the Mayer liturgy of 1841, which has services only for sacraments and the like, but none for Sabbath worship. A small liturgy, based on the Palatine, was published by the Ohio synod (1832), but it also had no forms for the Sabbath services. Coincident with the rise of Mercersburg theology there was a development of liturgical worship for the Lord's Day services also. A provisional liturgy was published and later the order of worship was introduced into many of the eastern congregations; but the western and German part of the church retain the free services. Baptism is by sprinkling and the Lord's Supper is generally celebrated by the communicants coming forward to and standing at the chancel. Confirmation is practised as a public act of confession of faith. In worship, the congregations usually sit during the hymns and stand during prayer. In government the church is Presbyterian, having as its courts, rising in their order, congregation, consistory, classis, synod, and general synod. Historically its government has been more democratic than that of the Presbyterian Church in this country, its congregations reserving more rights. The Mercersburg party, with its high idea of worship, also urged higher ideas of government and thus emphasized aristocratic Presbyterianism. They stressed the authority of the higher church courts while the Old Reformed party emphasized the liberty of lower church courts. The church, however, is a synodical organization rather than a general-synod organization, as its synods reserve certain important rights, such as the founding of theological seminaries. But latterly the general synod has been gaining in authority as the general activities of the church in home and foreign missions, Sunday-school work, ministerial relief, and the like are being centered in it. The general synod meets once in three years.

JAMES I. GOOD.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: On the history: J. I. Good, *The Origin of the Reformed Church in Germany*, Reading, Pa., 1887; idem, *History of the Reformed Church in Germany, 1620–1890*, ib. 1894; idem, *Historic Handbook of the Reformed*

Church in U. S., Reading, 1897, Philadelphia, 1902; idem, *Hist. of the Reformed Church in U. S. (1725–92)*, Reading, 1899; idem, *Women of the Reformed Church*, Philadelphia, 1902; J. G. Buttner, *Die hochdeutsch-reformirte Kirche in den Vereinigten Staaten*, Schleiz, 1844; L. Mayer, *A History of the German Reformed Church*, vol. i., Philadelphia, 1851; H. Harbaugh and D. G. Heisler, *The Fathers of the German Reformed Church in Europe and America*, 6 vols., Reading, 1857–88; G. W. Williard, *The History of Heidelberg College*, Cincinnati, 1879; J. H. Dubbs, *Historic Manual of the Reformed Church in the U. S.*, Lancaster, 1885; idem, *The Founding of the German Churches in Pennsylvania*, Philadelphia, 1893; idem, in *American Church History Series*, vol. viii., New York, 1895; idem, *The Reformed Church in Pennsylvania*, Lancaster, 1902; S. R. Fisher, *History of Publication Efforts in the Reformed Church*, Philadelphia, 1885; T. Appel, *The Beginnings of the Theological Seminary*, ib. 1886; H. J. Ruetenik, *Handbuch der christlichen Kirchengeschichte*, Cleveland, 1890; J. L. Fluck, *History of the Reformed Churches in Chester County*, Norristown, 1829; J. I. Swander, *The Reformed Church*, Dayton, n.d.

On doctrine and liturgy: S. Helffenstein, *The Doctrines of Divine Revelation*, Philadelphia, 1842; P. Schaff, *The Principle of Protestantism*, Chambersburg, 1845; J. W. Nevin, *The Liturgical Question*, Philadelphia, 1862; idem, *Vindication of the Revised Liturgy*, ib. 1867; J. H. A. Bomberger, *The Revised Liturgy*, Philadelphia, 1867; idem, *Reformed not Ritualistic. A Reply to Dr. Nevin's "Vindication,"* ib. 1867; I. A. Dorner, *The Liturgical Conflict in the Reformed Church in N. A.*, Philadelphia, 1868; G. B. Russell, *Creed and Customs*, Philadelphia, 1869; E. V. Gerhart, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, 2 vols., New York, 1891–95.

REFORMED (HUNGARIAN) CHURCH IN AMERICA: In the earlier stages of the Hungarian immigration to this country those who were identified with the Reformed churches of their own land to a considerable degree united with the Reformed Church in the United States or with the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. As their congregations increased in numbers, a separate classis in the Reformed Church in the United States was organized for them, but there were quite a number who desired closer connection with the Mother Church in Hungary, especially with a view to securing pastors familiar with their own language. Appeals were made to Hungary, resulting in the visit in 1902 to this country of Count Joseph Degenfeld, curator-general of the Reformed Church in Hungary. As a result of his observations and of a report made by him on his return, the General Convention of the Reformed Church in Hungary decided to assist such congregations as were willing to submit themselves to its care and supervision, both by sending ministers and by rendering financial aid.

The Hungarian Reformed Church in America was organized on Oct. 7, 1904, in New York City, with 6 congregations and 6 ministers. At the time of the census (1906) there were 16 organizations, with 18 ministers and 5,253 members, worshiping in 11 church edifices and 4 halls, owning church property valued at $123,500, besides 6 parsonages worth $26,500. The membership included 3,404 males and 1,549 females. There were 4 Sunday-schools with 179 scholars.

EDWIN MUNSELL BLISS.

REFORMED LEAGUE FOR GERMANY (REFORMIERTER BUND FUER DEUTSCHLAND): An association, inspired in part by the Alliance of the Reformed Churches (q.v.), founded in Aug., 1884, at Marburg on the occasion of a meeting of Reformed pastors and elders to celebrate the four-hundredth anniversary of Zwingli's birth. Marburg was chosen as the place because the Zurich Reformer had been there at the celebrated colloquy of 1529 to endeavor to secure harmony with Luther in regard to eucharistic doctrine. The meeting of 1884 accordingly stood for the irenic principles of Zwingli, who had declared that he would rather be at one with Luther than with any one else, and, as a result, a program was drawn up to bring together the scattered members of the Reformed Church throughout Germany The union was to be voluntary in character, and was in no way intended to interfere with territorial divisions or with the varying legal status of the Reformed Church bodies. It was made plain in the resolutions passed by the meeting that the league was not directed against the Lutheran Church nor against the union, where it existed, of both the Protestant communions, the intention being simply to strengthen the internal life of the two churches and to render each other all possible assistance, with express declaration of the equality of both communions and avoidance of all interference in internal administration. Provision was also made for the financial support of needy congregations and for the organization of foundations to conserve Reformed principles. The movement has proved successful; its membership has increased each year; and it now extends over nearly the entire German Empire. Conventions are held biennially, while in the intervening year the moderator presides over less formal meetings in various Reformed communities. So far as the finances of the Reformierter Bund permit, institutions for clerical education have been founded, and a number of religious journals, especially weeklies, have been established. (F H. BRANDES.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The "Proceedings" of the conventions have appeared in the *Reformierte Kirchenzeitung* and in special issues at Elberfeld, while reports by G. D. Mathews have been given in the *Quarterly Register of the Presbyterian Alliance.*

REFORMED PRESBYTERIANS. For the various bodies bearing this name see PRESBYTERIANS, I., 5, III., 2, VIII., 5, 7, 11. Also see SCOTLAND.

REFORMED SYNOD OF THE SOUTH, ASSOCIATE. See PRESBYTERIANS, VIII., 5.

REGALE (Lat., "royal prerogative"): The alleged right of the State to share in the administration of the Church, especially to enjoy the incomes of a diocese during a vacancy of the see and to appoint to all benefices falling vacant in the bishopric during this period, except to such as involve the cure of souls. The earliest allusions to the claim in Germany date from the reigns of Henry V (d. 1125) and Conrad III. (d. 1152), and in 1166 Barbarossa expressly set forth his claims to regalia both of

In Germany. revenues and of service in regard to the archdiocese of Cologne, basing his demand on custom as well as on ancient imperial and royal law. It is evident, moreover, that, at least toward the end of his reign, this emperor extended the term of the regalia to a year and a day after the enthronement of a new diocesan. The

Curia, on the other hand, sought to do away with the regalia and to make the incomes in question its own, the result being the system, which still in part exists, of annates (see TAXATION, ECCLESIASTICAL). It was not, however, until the pontificate of Innocent III. that the German monarchs surrendered their claims to the regalia, Philip of Swabia, in 1203, being the first to do so. His example was followed not only by his rival, Otto IV. (1209), but also by Frederick II. (1213, 1219), the latter emphasizing his renunciation by the Würzburg privilege of 1216. Nevertheless, practise and profession did not harmonize, probably because the surrender of the regalia was construed to apply to the annates only. Accordingly, in 1238 a decision of a court of Frederick II. explicitly affirmed the imperial right to all incomes of a vacant see until the election of a new bishop, and similar prerogatives were implied by the sixth canon of the second council of Lyons (1274). It is clear that the regalia extended even to the smaller churches, and it is equally certain that the ultimate source of the system was the institution of patronage (q.v.), for the patron who received certain fees and service from the incumbent would naturally lay claim to the entire revenue during a vacancy. The custom had been in vogue long before it received the name of regalia in the twelfth century. Then, when the old principle of church control based on property rights had decayed, the claim of regalia was evolved from the earlier system as one of a number of usufructs, and it received its name as including all secular possessions and prerogatives granted as royal fiefs to bishoprics and abbeys after the concordat of Worms in 1122. The regalia no longer applied to the more humble churches, as had originally been the case, but to the imperial churches, probably because of their feudal relations since the rise of the house of Hohenstaufen. The name, but not the right involved, was later transferred to non-royal churches. The theory of regalia, like the closely related concepts of the right of spoils (see SPOILS, RIGHT OF) and Investiture (q.v.), proceeded from the idea that the diocese, abbey, or parish was the property of the patron, i.e., the temporal lord. The regalia must have been extended to the imperial churches at an early period. The initial stages may be traced in the Carolingian period, when, during the vacancy of a see, there was a double system of ecclesiastical and royal administration; and the later development of the law of regalia in France conclusively proves that similar usage regarding sees and abbeys in West Franconia had been fully evolved before the decay of the Carolingians and the rise of the Capets, probably, therefore, in the course of the tenth century.

In France and England.

In France the institution of regalia, with its extension to a year after the enthronement of a new bishop, is mentioned by Bernard of Clairvaux in 1143 and by Louis VII. in 1147. Subsequent allusions are frequent, although all dioceses were not subject to the law of regalia, nor were the regalia the exclusive prerogative of the king. From Normandy the law of regalia was extended to England, where it was expressly declared by William II. in 1089, together with the right of spoils. This date serves to confirm the theory that the law of regalia was evolved during the period of private ownership of churches, and that it was not called into being by the termination of the investiture controversy or the recognition of the regalia as a fief. It long existed in England, with temporary limitations and abrogations, as is shown, for example, by the twelfth chapter of the Constitutions of Clarendon (1164). In France, until the union of the great fiefs with the crown, the right of regalia was possessed by the dukes of Normandy, Brittany, Burgundy, and others, as well as by the counts of Champagne, and, for a time, of Anjou. The entire situation during the rule of the Capets seems to indicate that it was inherited from the Carolingians. On the other hand, the ecclesiastical provinces of Bordeaux, Auch, Narbonne, Arles, Aux, Embrun, and Vienne were exempt. The right of regalia in France was administered by royal stewards and normally was restricted to the temporal emoluments of the see, while the rights of the deceased bishop's legatees were scrupulously recognized. At the same time the French kings held strenuously to the spiritual regalia, i.e., the appointment, during the vacancy of a see, to any benefice not involving pastoral care. This phase of the regalia is traceable to the feudal relation between the bishop and his clergy beginning with the ninth century; and it likewise gave the king the opportunity to put into office clergy devoted to his interests, and ultimately, through canons of this type, to influence episcopal elections. All this, however, gave rise to grave disputes, tried at first in the king's court, and after the thirteenth century before the parliament of Paris. The spiritual regalia, moreover, brought the kings of France into conflict with the papal claims to the general right of making ecclesiastical appointments. Boniface VIII. (q.v.), by his bull *Ausculta fili* (Dec. 5, 1301), vainly endeavored to compel Philip the Fair to modify his claims of regalia, and in 1375 Gregory XI. unreservedly admitted the royal rights of regalia.

The law of regalia received marked extension and intensification in France in the sixteenth century, when the power of the monarchy became absolute. The regalia, now construed by the jurists of the parliament of Paris to mean "royal laws" instead of "royal prerogatives," were made to include the entire kingdom. The clergy protested, but though, by his edict of Dec., 1606, Henry IV. restored the regalia to their traditional limits, the parliament refused compliance. A similar ordinance by Louis XIII., in 1629, was equally ineffectual, and finally the edict of Louis XIV., dated Feb. 10, 1673, bound the clergy to submit to the universal extension of the law. In two breves (Sept. 21, 1678, and Dec. 27, 1679) Innocent XI. required the French king to abrogate his edict, but the clergy of France, including such Jansenists as Antoine Arnauld (q.v.), and moved by a variety of motives, not the least of which was Gallicanism, were on the royal side, their attitude being voiced by the famous "General Assembly of the Clergy of France" at Paris in 1681–82 (see GALLICANISM, § 2). In an edict of Jan., 1682, the king repeated his claims on

the regalia with due consideration for the requirements of canon law, but Innocent XI. (breve of Apr. 2, 1682) and Alexander VIII. (constitution *Inter multiplices*, Jan. 31, 1691) both condemned the measures adopted by the General Assembly, and on Sept. 14, 1693, the king and his clergy formally surrendered to Innocent XII., the decree of Mar. 22, 1682, being formally revoked. Nevertheless, there was little practical alteration in the royal attitude toward the regalia, and the laws in question were actually abrogated only by the confiscation of the property of the Church at the French Revolution. The regalia were, however, revived for a brief time by Napoleon in his decree of Nov. 6, 1813 (arts. 33–34, 45), and from 1880 until the separation of Church and State in France, which went into effect Jan. 1, 1906, the Third Republic again applied the law with increased exactions.

(Ulrich Stutz.)

Bibliography: Documents are quoted in Reich, *Documents*, pp. 303–307, 379 sqq., and in Thatcher and McNeal, *Documents*, nos. 83, 103. On the general subject and for Germany consult: E. Friedberg, *De finium inter ecclesiam et civitatem regundorum judicio*, pp. 220 sqq., Leipsic, 1861; J. Berchtold, *Die Entwicklung der Landeshoheit*, pp. 65 sqq., 128 sqq., Munich, 1863; P Scheffer-Boichorst, *Kaisers Friedrichs I. letzter Streit mit der Kurie*, pp. 189 sqq., Berlin, 1866; G. Waitz, *Deutsche Verfassungsgeschichte*, vol. viii., Kiel, 1877; C. Frey, *Die Schicksale des königlichen Gutes in Deutschland unter den letzten Staufen*, pp. 241 sqq., Berlin, 1881; C. W. Nitzsch, *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes*, ii. 255–259, 3 vols., Altenburg, 1883–1885; H. Geffcken, *Die Krone und das niedere deutsche Kirchengut unter Kaiser Friedrich II. (1210 bis 1250)*, pp. 120 sqq., Jena, 1890; G. Blondel, *Étude sur la politique de l'empereur Frédéric II. en Allemagne*, pp. 243 sqq., Paris, 1892; H. Krabbo, *Die Besetzung der deutschen Bistümer unter der Regierung Kaiser Friedrichs II.*, Berlin, 1901; and the works on the German law by E. Friedberg, Leipsic, 1903, and R. Schröder, ib. 1902.

For France consult: C. Gérin, *Recherches historiques sur l'assemblée du clergé de 1682*, Paris, 1869; idem, *Louis XIV et le saint-siège*, 2 vols., ib. 1894; J. T. Loyson, *L'Assemblée du clergé de 1682*, Paris, 1870; G. Phillips, *Das Regalienrecht in Frankreich*, Halle, 1873; E. Michaud, *Louis XIV et Innocent XI.*, 4 vols., Paris, 1883; F. H. Reusch, *Der Index der verbotenen Bücher*, ii. 560 sqq., Bonn, 1885; A. Luchaire, *Histoire des institutions monarchiques de la France sous les premiers Capétiens*, ii. 59 sqq., Paris, 1891; idem, *Manuel des institutions françaises*, passim, ib. 1898; Imbart de la Tour, *Les Elections épiscopales dans l'église de France du 9. au 12. siècle*, pp. 127 sqq., 453 sqq., Paris, 1891; L. Mention, *Documents relatifs aux rapports de clergé avec royauté, 1682–1705*, Paris, 1893; P. Viollet, *Histoire des institutions politiques et administratives de la France*, ii. 158, 345 sqq., Paris, 1898; Ranke, *Popes*, ii. 417–427.

For England consult: F. Makower, *Die Verfassung der Kirche von England*, pp. 326 sqq., Berlin, 1894; H. Böhmer, *Kirche und Staat in England und in der Normandie im 11. und 12. Jahrhundert*, Leipsic, 1899.

REGENERATION.

Definition and Implications (§ 1).
Biblical Doctrine (§ 2).
In the Early and Medieval Churches (§ 3).
In the Reformation (§ 4).
Pietism (§ 5).
In Modern Theology (§ 6).
The Doctrine Presented (§ 7).

Regeneration means the entrance into the Christian state of salvation as a new beginning of life, involving also the abandonment of the former mode of existence as well as the far-reaching consequences of the course entered upon. In connection with the Christian doctrine of Atonement and Redemption (qq.v.) the idea of regeneration contains the following factors: (1) The state of salvation is unconditionally the work of God; (2) this state signifies such a rupture with the past that the claims of sin, the law, and the world no longer have validity; (3) it is the creation of a new type of life, determined by God, which needs to be developed and matured, but does not require anything else by which it may receive its character as a state of salvation; (4) it opens to the new personality the path of a growth and an activity, the tendency and goal of which are determined by the beginning set by God. The effort to assign to regeneration a coordinate place among the more specific concepts in the scheme of salvation, such as conversion, justification, and sanctification, has always led to unstable results. Either the term threatened to absorb the others, or it was limited in a way not consistent with the comprehensive range of the Biblical view.

1. Definition and Implications.

An exact equivalent of regeneration is found in the New Testament only in a few passages. The Greek word *palingenesia*, which corresponds most directly, is used only in Titus iii. 5, where it refers to the individual renewal of life, which there is connected with baptism; and in Matt. xix. 28, where it refers to the eschatological renewal of the world. In I Pet. i. 3 the resurrection of Christ is mentioned as the act that effects regeneration; in i. 23 the living and eternal Word of God appears as the productive seed. But indirectly the thought of a renewal of life by faith in Christ lies at the basis of a number of passages in the New Testament. In the Old Testament it is prepared by the prophecy of a conversion of Israel to be wrought by God (Jer. xxxi. 18, 33 sqq.; Isa. lx. 21). It is described as the gift of another heart and of a new spirit (Ezek. xi. 19 sqq., xxxvi. 25 sqq.; Ps. li. 12). With this prophecy John the Baptist connects his demand of repentance with which is associated the symbol of the cleansing of baptism (Matt. iii. 1 sqq.). The religious and moral demands of Jesus rest upon the testimony of a prevening act of God which enables a new attitude (Matt. xviii. 23 sqq., xv. 13, xix. 26). It is necessary to make a new beginning (Matt. xviii. 3), and the death of Jesus is designated as the decisive act of salvation that originates a new relation to God (Mark x. 45; Matt. xxvi. 28). The apostolic preaching represents the operation of a thoroughgoing renewal of life in consequence of the death and resurrection of the Redeemer. Paul does not use in the older epistles the term "regeneration," but the idea of a new creation occupies an important part. God fulfils in Christ, the second Adam, a new creation of humanity (I Cor. xv. 45). Christ's death is the end of the old, his resurrection the beginning of a new life, which from him is transferred to his adherents (Rom. vi. 4 sqq.; II Cor. iv. 10, v. 17; Gal. ii. 19–20; Eph. ii. 5–6; Col. ii. 12). The Christian therefore is a new creation (Gal. vi. 15); a new man (Col. iii. 10; Eph. iv. 24). The entrance into this new state of life is connected with baptism (Rom. vi. 3 sqq.; Col. ii. 11 sqq.), which, however, is not without faith (Gal.

2. Biblical Doctrine.

iii. 26–27). In this new state of life there are to be distinguished two aspects: justification, which delivers man from the guilt and the condemnation of sin (Rom. v. 18–19; Gal. ii. 16), and the endowment with the Spirit of God (Gal. iii. 5, iv. 6; Rom. viii. 2); although Paul did not strictly discriminate between the two. Objectively the new creation consists in the mission and work of Christ; subjectively in the faith called forth by it. The demarkation of the new creation from the subsequent unfolding of the new life is made difficult in that sanctification appears now as, with justification, a newly implanted life tendency (I Cor. vi. 11), and again as a continuous task (Rom. vi. 19–22), and in that the new life is even represented as ever undergoing a retransformation (Rom. xii. 2, xiii. 14; Eph. iv. 22 sqq.). I Peter connects the new creation with the resurrection of Christ (i. 3). The means of this renewal of life consists of the Word of God (i. 23); this serves also the growth and strengthening of the newly born babes (ii. 2 sqq.). In the Johannine writings birth is represented from God (John i. 12 sqq.), or the birth from above is a frequent designation of the state of the Christian. This divine generation of the new man produces the state of the children of God, which is here restoration of a relation with the being of God. The possibility of such a state is produced by the incarnation of the Logos (John i. 12); its realization is the work of the Spirit (iii. 6, 8). To the Word is ascribed mediation in so far as it is the medium of the Spirit (vi. 63). As a further medium of the spiritual new birth is mentioned the water of baptism (iii. 5); but it is merely a step preparatory for the renovation by the Spirit. Regeneration must be experienced by faith (John i. 12; I John v. 1). In some passages of the Johannine writings the life from God appears as a possession which excludes not only apostasy, but also the sinning of the new man (I John iii. 6, 9). According to other passages not only may Christians sin (I John i. 8 sqq., ii. 1), they may sin even unto death (v. 16). With John, therefore, regeneration is represented as the transposition into a new stage of life which is essentially relationship with God; but also with him the transition takes place through faith, and the new state of life is conditioned by the moral preservation of the endowed character.

3. In the Early and Medieval Churches.

The conception of regeneration has no definite place in the terminology of the doctrine of salvation in the early and medieval Church, and no connected history; because in the post-apostolic time there reigned a moralistic conception of salvation. It indeed offered room for the acts of human self-activity which introduce and accompany the new life, such as repentance, recognition of the truth, fulfilment of the law, with but slight connection of these with the divine operation and the mediator of salvation; but this jejune conception was supplemented by a faith in the magic and supernatural effect of baptism and the Lord's Supper. The Eastern Church recognized the universal regeneration of humanity in the incarnation of the Logos, but it knew little of the renewal of life in the individual. Augustine traced regeneration entirely to the effect of grace; but he associated this with the mediation of the Church, and as he saw in the new life not so much a possession of faith as the activity of love, he confounded the conceptions of regeneration and sanctification. Scholasticism resolved the cultivation of the new life into a number of the Church's impartations of grace and the corresponding efforts of will, which scarcely admitted of a unified conception of regeneration. Thomas Aquinas preferred the most impersonal expression which the New Testament offers for the idea of regeneration, "participation in the divine nature" (*Summa*, ii. 110). For the Council of Trent regeneration was only another name for justification (*Sessio*, vi. 3), which found its consummation in the "infusion of love." For the mystics who have a special preference for the picture of regeneration, it meant essentially union with God afforded to the soul that was emptied of the world and selfhood. But this individual experience of the pious absolved itself in the moment of subjective feeling, and was not sobered by a firm hold upon the historical divine will of grace.

4. In the Reformation.

The Reformation restored to regeneration its firm connection with God's act of salvation in Christ. In the forgiveness of sin man finds the basis of a new existence. The faith that receives this blessing is the immediate reality of a new life. Faith itself is, according to Luther, the new birth. In faith we are both justified and sanctified. This view was not affected by Luther's association of regeneration and baptism. He assumed even the difficulty of the idea of faith in infants in order to maintain the same saving operation in children and adults. The same intimate connection of justification and new life is found in Melanchthon's *Loci* of 1521 and in the *Apology*. The latter does not limit the term "justification" to the conception of a mere declaration of being just, but unhesitatingly denotes "justification" as "regeneration" and faith as the "rightness of heart" demanded by God as "obedience toward the Gospel." Justification included moral renewal and the endowment of the Spirit. This merging was due to the apprehension of justification not as a transcendent act of God but as a human experience; but in the commentary on Romans (1532) Melanchthon began to connect more strictly the judgment of God declaring man as just with Christ's work of atonement and to exclude from it every reference to the transformation of man that begins with faith. Calvin conceived regeneration as "penitence" and restricted it to the moral act of the mortification of the old man and the generation of the new. The Formula of Concord (q.v.) left the conception of regeneration vague, while it, on the other hand, clearly defined justification, thus exposing the relation of faith to morals, now excluded from justification, to neglect. The period of the Reformation left to later theology a number of unsolved questions regarding regeneration, such as the relation of the Spirit to the individual. The Augsburg Confession (q.v.) states that the Spirit effects faith (Art. 5) and that faith conditions the possession of the Spirit (Art. 20). These statements are not con-

tradictory if by the Spirit that effects faith is understood the Spirit of God incorporate in the Word and the congregation, and by the Spirit that is imparted to faith the individualized spirit dwelling in the believer. But as this distinction was generally unobserved, there resulted a different interpretation of regeneration in the process of salvation. If Luther's conception of regeneration as the "gift of faith" was to be adhered to, it must neccessarily be considered as the presupposition of the life of faith in general and consequently as preceding justification. But if one holds the idea that only the individual possession of the spirit effects regeneration, then regeneration is the consequence of the sonship attained in faith. In the latter instance regeneration is reduced to a secondary position but receives a richer ethical import. Still more important for the later development of the doctrine was the question in regard to the relation of regeneration to baptism. Some dogmaticians adhered to the bold thesis of Luther that the baptism of infants and the regeneration of adults by faith in the Word were essentially the same process. But the later theologians taught in connection with the doctrine of baptism a regeneration which was not at the same time a renovation of life, but communicated to the soul chained by hereditary sin the capacity to believe. In this way the conception of regeneration was considerably emptied and placed where it could no longer serve as an expression of the experience of salvation.

5. Pietism.

Pietism opposed this shallow conception of regeneration, representing it as an experience of faith, and was intent upon insuring its development into a new moral attitude. Spener (q.v.) taught that in the moment of regeneration, which coincides with that of justification, there is posited in the believer a new principle of life that develops into sanctification. The Lutheran doctrine of justification was the basis of the certainty of salvation also for Zinzendorf (q.v.), but in one period of his life he held a mystico-theosophic theory of regeneration, representing it not so much as an experience of faith as a mysterious penetration of the power of the blood of Christ. Similar thoughts of a substantial or physiological interpretation of regeneration are found in P. Nicolai (q.v.) at the beginning of the seventeenth century, in the Swabian Pietism, in J. A. Bengel, F. C. Oetinger, and Michael Hahn (qq.v.). Also in modern Pietism frequently Methodistic thoughts appear of a second experience of grace after justification that is to lead man to the threshold of sinless perfection. In this the fact is overlooked that justifying faith conceived in its Biblical and Reformation depth includes already this second act of self-surrender.

6. In Modern Theology.

The treatment of the conception of regeneration in modern theology presents a variegated if not confused picture. A stimulating influence upon the development of dogma was Immanuel Kant's postulate of radical evil and the deepening of the idea of personality by the distinction of the "intelligible" and the empiric character. What R. Eucken, following J. G. Fichte, indicates as "*Wesensbildung*" is essentially a philosophical parallel to Christian regeneration. The fruit of philosophical idealism was made especially productive for theology by Schleiermacher, who taught that regeneration on the subjective side as the reception of the individual into the life communion of Christ corresponds to redemption as the communication of sinless perfection and blessedness. It is the foundation of a new character, while sanctification is its unfolding. The change that has begun with regeneration may be regarded either as a changed form of life, conversion, the elements of which are repentance and faith; or as a changed relation to God or a changed feeling of life, justification. Most of the theologians who followed Schleiermacher returned to that sense of justification according to which it is grounded upon a divine judgment, without, however, relinquishing the thought that this judgment accrues to the believer only in so far as he is in real union with Christ. Thus in avoiding an empty concept of faith, they returned to the original Reformation idea. Four other types parallel to the above may be distinguished: (1) The adherence to the combination of regeneration and baptism, involving the belabored efforts of integrating the turning to God or conversion later in life with infant baptism; (2) the theosophical representation of regeneration is that of a transubstantiation. Richard Rothe (q.v.), with his followers, approaches from his conception of the spirit as the unity of the ideal and the natural existence. From regeneration there follows the positing of a spiritual nature which is to unfold in organic growth toward imperishable results. (3) Another group of theologians, among them especially Albrecht Ritschl (q.v.), replaces the conception of regeneration by that of justification in order to prevent every Pietistic obscuration of the doctrine of grace. Regeneration, if the term is preferred, is not to be distinguished from justification or adoption. Ethical transformation is hereby secured in that, in reconciliation, the purpose of the kingdom of God is appropriated and by doing good, freedom from the world, or eternal life, is attained. Johann Georg Wilhelm Herrmann (q.v.) insists that regeneration can not be established externally as a fact, but only by a judgment of faith. This judgment bases itself not upon our possession, but upon the attitude which God in Christ assumes toward us. According to Julius Wilhelm Martin Kaftan (q.v.) the divine act of redemption fulfilled in Christ, especially in his death and resurrection, becomes by faith a personal experience involving ethical renewal. In the conception of regeneration these three elements are by faith perceived as a totality. (4) Richard Adelbert Lipsius (q.v.) designates regeneration as the ethical side of the state of grace in distinction from justification as its religious side. Regeneration accordingly is called the logical consequence of justification.

Regeneration is here represented as the divinely wrought origin of a new, personal existence. But the term can denote only its origin; the preservation and growth of the new life are not included in the conception, but are to be represented as the state of the children of God. Moreover, there is

no need to include the objective basis of salvation in the conception of regeneration, although the New Testament occasionally expresses the close connection of the new personality with the person and work of the mediator of salvation (Eph. vi. 6, 10; I Pet. i. 3). For the historical basis of salvation there are used other conceptions, Atonement and Redemption (qq.v.), and the idea of regeneration is more appropriate for application to individuals than to the comprehensive followship. There is no reason to break with the view offered by the Reformation in connecting regeneration with the origin of faith, or as Luther has it, that the new birth is faith. By faith not only is the divine judgment of justification appropriated but a union is effected with Christ transforming the believer into a new person. Faith has thus not only a religious but an ethical meaning, in that it represents a receptive attitude toward the vivifying and determining influence of the Redeemer. Man's relation to God can not be measured by the diagnosis of the state of his own soul, but merely by the worth of Christ, the object of his faith; hence the certainty of salvation is not jeopardized. Owing to the condition of appropriation by faith, it is impossible to ascribe to the baptism of infants unconditionally the effect of regeneration; for the realization of the state of grace offered in baptism is not completed with that act. The advent of a new personality can only proceed in the light of self-consciousness. Moreover, the conceptions of regeneration and conversion form an indivisible unity; they denote the same beginning of a new life, only that regeneration characterizes it as an act of God and conversion as a new tendency of life assumed by the believer. It does not follow either from Scripture or the nature of the case that the new life of regeneration can not be lost, as the Reformed dogmaticians hold concerning the elect and as Rothe infers from the metaphysical essence of the spiritual existence. But it may be said that the communion with Christ having once become the fundamental tendency of life possesses an incomparable power to give a firmness to the unstable will, and that the surrender of it must appear intolerable to a person that has begun to experience the value of the blessing of salvation. (O. Kirn.)

7. The Doctrine Presented.

Bibliography: The subject is treated in many of the works cited in and under Biblical Theology (q.v.), and of course in the works on systematic theology (for titles, etc., see Dogma, Dogmatics). Special treatises are: P. Gennrich, *Die Lehre von der Wiedergeburt in dogmengeschichtlicher und religionsgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung*, Leipsic, 1907; idem, *Wiedergeburt und Heiligung mit Bezug auf die gegenwärtigen Strömungen des religiösen Lebens*, ib. 1908; G. Duffield, *Spiritual Life; or, Regeneration*, Carlisle, 1832; G. S. Faber, *The Primitive Doctrine of Regeneration*, London, 1840; S. Charnock, *The Doctrine of Regeneration*, Philadelphia, [1843]; E. H. Sears, *Regeneration*, Boston, 1853; E. C. Wines, *A Treatise on Regeneration*, Philadelphia, 1863; A. Phelps, *The New Birth; or, the Work of the Holy Spirit*, Boston, 1866; W. Anderson, *Treatise on Regeneration*, 2d ed., Philadelphia, 1871; A. Ritschl, *Die christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung*, vol. iii., Bonn, 1874; G. T. Fox, *Doctrine of Regeneration*, London, 1880; G. Thomasius, *Christi Person und Werk*, iv., §§ 75–76, 2 vols., Leipsic, 1886–88; K. Heckel, *Die Idee der Wiedergeburt*, ib. 1889; G. N. Boardman, *Regeneration*, New York, 1891; E. Wacker, *Wiedergeburt und Bekehrung*, Gütersloh, 1893; A. B. Bruce, *St. Paul's Conception of Christianity*, chaps. x.–xiii., xvii., New York, 1894; C. Thieme, *Die sittliche Triebkraft des Glaubens*, Leipsic, 1895; R. Eucken, *Der Kampf um einen geistigen Lebensinhalt*, ib. 1896; idem, *Der Wahrheitsgehalt der Religion*, ib. 1901; J. B. Mayor, *Commentary on James*, pp. 186–189, London, 1897; C. Andresen, *Die Lehre von der Wiedergeburt auf theistischer Grundlage*, Hamburg, 1899; H. Cremer, *Taufe, Wiedergeburt, und Kindertaufe*, Gütersloh, 1901; J. Herzog, *Der Begriff der Bekehrung*, Giessen, 1903; O. Scheel, *Die dogmatische Behandlung der Taufe in der modernen positiven Theologie*, Tübingen, 1906; P. Lessau, *Wiedergeburt in der Taufe*, Neumünster, 1909; N. H. Marshall, *Conversion; or, The New Birth*, Ithaca, 1909; *DB*, iv. 214–221; *DCG*, ii. 485–489; Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire*, fasc. xxxiv. 1020–21; and the literature in Conversion.

For notices of a cognate idea in other religions cf.: E. Crawley, *Mystic Rose*, 305, 270 sqq., New York, 1902; idem, *Tree of Life*, pp. 56–57, London, 1905; G. Anrich, *Das antike Mysterienwesen*, Göttingen, 1894; B. Spencer and F. J. Gillen, *The Native Tribes of Central Australia*, p. 246, London, 1899; and much of the literature under Mithra, Mithraism.

REGENSBURG, re'gens-bürg", **BISHOPRIC OF:** A German diocese founded in the eighth century. Christianity evidently entered Regensburg previous to the reign of Constantine, but after the Romans withdrew, the community of Roman Christians disappeared. After the refoundation of the city, when the Bavarians had conquered the country, the ducal house of Agilolfings, apparently of Frankish descent, was Christian, and it may be conjectured that here, as in Bavaria, the land became Christianized through the combined influence of the Franks and of Celtic missionaries. Although the region was long controlled by abbots with quasi-episcopal authority, it was not until the eighth century that the see of Regensburg was formally erected. For more than two centuries a Benedictine monastery took the place of a cathedral chapter, but in 974 the diocese and abbey were separarated. The ancient diocese was practically conterminous with the modern, for though Bohemia was long administered as a missionary province of Regensburg, Bishop Wolfgang (971–994) surrendered it so that it might be made a separate see. (A. Hauck.)

With the Reformation Regensburg became a stronghold of Protestantism, and the adherents of the ancient faith were compelled to struggle against intense opposition. Nevertheless, constant efforts were made to reform all that was amiss in matters pertaining to the Roman church, and education made progress, especially under Jesuit auspices. The campaigns of Gustavus Adolphus in the seventeenth century again struck heavily at the diocese, but after this peril was over, the Roman Catholics of Regensburg once more bent every effort to the improvement of religion and education. From 1805 to 1817 Regensburg was made a metropolitan see of somewhat uncertain ecclesiastical standing, and in the latter year was degraded to a suffragan diocese of Munich-Freising. In 1821, however, it regained the independence as a separate see which it still enjoys. It now forms part of the archdiocese of Munich-Freising, and had, in 1909, 470 parishes and 32 deaneries, 1,086 secular and 147 regular priests, a seminary and lyceum at Regensburg, and a Roman Catholic population of 826,751.

Bibliography: T. Ried, *Codex chronologico-diplomaticus episcopatus Ratisbonensis*, 2 vols., Regensburg, 1816; M. Hansiz, *De episcopatu Ratisbonensi prodromus*, Vienna, 1754; F. Janner, *Geschichte der Bischöfe von Regensburg*, 3 vols., Regensburg, 1889; Hauck, *KD*, passim. Lists of the bishops are in *MGH, Script.*, xiii (1881), 359 sqq., and Gams, *Series episcoporum*, supplement, pp. 76–78.

REGENSBURG BOOK. See Regensburg, Conference of.

REGENSBURG, CONFERENCE OF: A conference held at Regensburg in 1541, which marks the culmination of attempts to restore religious unity in Germany by means of conferences.

The Conference. It was a continuation of negotiations at Hagenau (June, 1540; see Hagenau, Conference of) and at Worms (q.v.), where the deliberations began on Jan. 14, 1541, on the basis of the Augsburg Confession and the Apology, but after four days were adjourned by the emperor to the session of the diet which was soon to meet at Regensburg. On Dec. 15, 1540, a secret conference took place between Johann Gropper, canon of Cologne, and Gerhard Veltwick, the imperial secretary, on the one side, and Butzer and Capito, the delegates of Strasburg, on the other. An agreement was reached on the questions of original sin and justification, but the concession made by the Roman Catholics at Hagenau, to negotiate on the basis of the Augsburg Confession and the Apology, was withdrawn. On Jan. 5 Butzer laid a German draft of the conclusions reached before the Landgrave, who approved it as preliminary to an agreement and sent it to Joachim II., elector of Brandenburg, with the request to communicate it to Luther and the other princes of the Protestant league. The document was essentially identical with the later so-called Regensburg Book, which formed the basis of the Regensburg Conference in place of the Augsburg Confession. It was divided into twenty-three articles, some of which closely approached the Evangelical view; but it decided no dogmatic question and did not exclude the Roman conceptions. On Feb. 13, 1541, the book was in the hands of Luther. In spite of the apparent concessions made in regard to the doctrine of justification, he perceived that the proposed articles of agreement could be accepted by neither party. On Feb. 23 the emperor entered Regensburg. In consideration of his difficult political situation, especially of the threatening war with the Turks and the negotiations of the French king with the Evangelicals, it was his desire to pacify Germany. The conference was opened on Apr. 5. The interlocutors were Gropper, Pflug, and Eck on the one side, Butzer, the elder Johannes Pistorius, and Melanchthon on the other. Besides the presidents, Count Palatine Frederick and Cardinal Granvella, six witnesses were present, among them Burkhardt and Feige, chancellors of Saxony and Hesse, and Jakob Sturm of Strasburg. The first four articles, on the condition and integrity of man before the fall, on free will, on the cause of sin, and on original sin, passed without difficulty. The article on justification encountered great opposition, especially from Eck, but an agreement was finally arrived at; neither Elector John Frederick nor Luther was satisfied with this article. With respect to the articles on the doctrinal authority of the Church, the hierarchy, discipline, sacraments, etc., no agreement was possible, and they were all passed over without result. On May 31 the book with the changes agreed upon and nine counterpropositions of the Protestants was returned to the emperor. In spite of the opposition of Mainz, Bavaria, and the imperial legate, Charles V. still hoped for an agreement on the basis of the articles which had been accepted by both parties, those in which they differed being postponed to a later time. As it was perceived that all negotiations would be in vain if the consent of Luther were not obtained, a deputation headed by John of Anhalt arrived at Wittenberg on June 9. Luther answered in a polite and almost diplomatic way. He expressed satisfaction in reference to the agreement on some of the articles, but did not believe in the sincerity of his opponents and made his consent dependent upon conditions which he knew could not be accepted by the Roman Catholics. Before the deputation had returned, the Roman party had entirely destroyed all hope of union. The formula of justification, which Contarini had sent to Rome, was rejected by a papal consistory. Rome declared that the matter could be settled only at a council, and this opinion was shared by the stricter party among the estates. Albert of Mainz urged the emperor to take up arms against the Protestants. Charles V tried in vain to induce the Protestants to accept the disputed articles, while Joachim of Brandenburg made new attempts to bring about an agreement. With every day the gulf between the opposing parties became wider, and both of them, even the Roman Catholics, showed a disposition to ally themselves with France against the emperor.

Its Outcome. Thus the fate of the Regensburg Book was no longer doubtful. After Elector John Frederick and Luther had become fully acquainted with its contents, their disinclination was confirmed, and Luther demanded most decidedly that even the articles agreed upon should be rejected. On July 5 the estates rejected the emperor's efforts for union. They demanded an investigation of the articles agreed upon, and that in case of necessity they should be emendated and explained by the papal legate. Moreover, the Protestants were to be compelled to accept the disputed articles; in case of their refusal a general or national council was to be convoked. Contarini received instructions to announce to the emperor that all settlement of religious and ecclesiastical questions should be left to the pope. Thus the whole effort for union was already frustrated, even before the Protestant estates declared that they insisted upon their counterpropositions in regard to the disputed articles.

The supposed results of the religious conference were to be laid before a general or national council or before an assembly of the empire which was to be convoked within eighteen months. In the mean time the Protestants were bound to adhere to the articles agreed upon, not to publish anything on them, and not to abolish any churches or monasteries, while the prelates were requested to reform

their clergy at the order of the legate. The peace of Nuremberg was to extend until the time of the future council, but the Augsburg Recess was to be maintained. These decisions might have become very dangerous to the Protestants, and in order not to force them into an alliance with his foreign opponents, the emperor decided to change some of the resolutions in their favor; but the Roman Catholics did not acknowledge his declaration. As he was not willing to expose himself to an interpellation on their part, he left Regensburg on June 29, without having obtained an agreement or a humiliation of the Protestants, and the Roman party looked upon him with greater mistrust than the Protestants. (T. KOLDE.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sources are: M. Butzer, *Acta colloquii in comitiis imperii Ratisbonæ*, Augsburg, 1542; idem, *Alle Handlungen und Schriften zu Vergleichung der Religion zu Regenspuerg*, ib. 1542; J. Eck, *Apologia . . adversus mucores et calumnias Buceri*, Ingolstadt, 1542; idem, *Auff Butzers falsch auszschreiben Schutzrede*, ib. 1542; idem, *Replica adversus scripta secunda Buceri*, ib. 1543; J. Calvin, in *CR*, xxxiii. 509 sqq. Consult: M. Lenz, *Briefwechsel Landgrafs Philip mit Bucer*, 3 vols., Leipsic, 1880; K. T. Hergang, *Das Religionsgespräch zu Regensburg und das Regensburger Buch*, Cassel, 1858; T. Brieger, *Gasparo Contarini und das Regensburger Konkordienwerk*, Gotha, 1870; idem, *De formulæ concordiæ Ratisbonensis origine et indole*, Halle, 1870; H. Schäfer, *De libri Ratisbonensis origine atque historia*, Bonn, 1870; F. Dittrich, *Regesten und Briefe des . . Contarini*, Braunsberg, 1881; idem, *Gasparo Contarini*, ib. 1885; Ranke, *Popes*, i. 110 sqq.; Moeller, *Christian Church*, iii. 139 sqq.; and literature on BUTZER; CONTARINI; ECK; LUTHER; and the REFORMATION IN GERMANY.

REGINO, rê-gī'nō: Abbot of Prüm; b., according to a sixteenth-century tradition, at Altrip (a village near Ludwigshafen, 36 m. s. of Mainz) in the ninth century; d. at Treves 915. He entered the monastery of Prüm, and in May, 892, was chosen abbot, but was forced by jealous opponents to resign in 899. He then went to Treves, where Archbishop Ratbod entrusted to him the restoration and administration of the monastery of St. Martin, which had been destroyed by the Normans. Since, however, he was buried in the monastery of St. Maximinus near Treves, it would seem that he was not in control of St. Martin's at the time of his death. All the known works of Regino were composed at Treves. In 906 he wrote his *Libri duo de synodalibus causis et disciplinis ecclesiasticis* (best ed. by F. G. A. Wasserschleben, Leipsic, 1840) to further episcopal discipline; he also composed a treatise on the theory of church music, the *De harmonica institutione* (ed. C. E. H. de Coussemaker, *Scriptores de musica medii ævi*, Paris, 1863–76, ii. 1–73). His most important work, however, was the *Chronica*, from the birth of Christ to 906, which was completed by 908 and was the first German attempt at a universal history (best ed. by F. Kurtze, *MGH, Script. rer. Germ.*, Hanover, 1890). The work falls into two books, from 1 to 741 and from 741 to 906, the latter portion being practically restricted to Frankish history, especially of the western Frankish kingdom. This second part is of great value for Lothringian history, and it was continued to 967 at the monastery of St. Maximinus, apparently by Adalbert, subsequently archbishop of Magdeburg. (O. HOLDER-EGGER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. C. F. Bähr, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur im karolingischen Zeitalter*, pp. 184–186, 535–538, Carlsruhe, 1840; E. Dümmler, in *Jahrbücher der deutschen Geschichte, Jahrbücher des ostfrankischen Reiches*, 3 vols., Leipsic, 1887–88; H. Ermisch, *Die Chronik des Regino bis 813*, Göttingen, 1872; J. Hartung, in *Forschungen der deutschen Geschichte*, xvii. 362–368, ib. 1878; J. Loserth, in *Archiv für österreichische Geschichte*, lxi (1880), 4–19; P. Schulz, *Die Chronik des Regino vom Jahr 813 an*, Halle, 1888; A. Ebert, *Allgemeine Geschichte der Litteratur des Mittelalters*, iii. 226–331, Leipsic, 1889; H. Isenhart, *Ueber den Verfasser und die Glaubwürdigkeit der Continuatio Reginonis*, Kiel, 1890; Wattenbach, *DGQ*, i (1904), 311–314; F. Kurze, in *NA*, xv. 293–330; *ADB*, xxvii. 557.

REGIONARIUS, re"gi-on-ā'rî-us: In the pre-medieval Roman Church an official, primarily a deacon, placed over one of the ecclesiastical regions, originally seven in number, of the city of Rome. The institution is ascribed by the *Liber pontificalis* to both Clement I. and Fabian, the latter being the more probable. Each deacon was assisted by a subdeacon and a notary, while the *Ordo Romanus* also mentions regionary acolytes, and Gregory I. seems to have established "regionary defenders." The seven *regionarii* of Rome later became the cardinal deacons, whose number was raised to fourteen, and the regionary notaries were developed into the prothonotaries (see PROTHONOTARY APOSTOLIC). (A. HAUCK.)

REGIUM EXEQUATUR. See PLACET.

REGULA FIDEI ("RULE OF FAITH"): A term used so frequently in early Christian literature from the last quarter of the second century that an understanding of it is necessary to a correct idea of the religious conceptions of that period. Different forms with more or less the same meaning occur. *Ho kanon tēs alētheias* ("canon of truth"), *regula veritatis* (rule of truth), probably the oldest form, was used apparently by Dionysius of Corinth (c. 160), then by Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Hippolytus, Tertullian, and Novatian; *ho kanon tēs pisteōs, regula fidei*, by Polycrates of Ephesus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, and by the later Latin writers. The equivalent use of these two expressions is important for the determination of the original significance attached to them. The truth itself is the standard by which teaching and practise are to be judged (cf. Irenæus, *Hær.*, II., xxviii. 1; *ANF*, i. 399). It is presupposed that this truth takes for the Christian community a definite, tangible form, such as the law was for the Jews (Rom. ii. 20), in a body of doctrine not merely held and taught by the Church, but clearly formulated. Besides the expressions already discussed, another is worth mentioning, found only in Greek writers and the versions from them—*ho ekklesiastikos kanōn* or *ho kanōn tēs ekklēsias* (Clement of Alexandria and Origen).

The ante-Nicene church never considered as the Rule of Faith the Bible or any part of it. Certain expressions of recent writers show that it is not unnecessary to point out that the word *kanon*, with or without qualifying additions, is never used until after Eusebius to designate the Bible, and that even after the word had begun to be applied to the collection of Scriptural books, the sense mentioned

above is never given to it by the Grecks. This is explained by the fact that the early Church used this word for something else—the baptismal formula. It is quite evident that in the oldest and most explicit witnesses for the use of the word, Irenæus and Tertullian, this was known primarily as the rule of faith. When the former (I., ix. 4) says "he who retains unchangeable in his heart the rule of the truth which he received by means of baptism," the expression "rule of truth" can not mean any sum total of truths as to which instruction has been conveyed before or after baptism, but only a formula which the neophyte has made his own by a profession of faith made at the time of baptism. This was "the faith," which the convert received from the teaching Church and was to keep as the standard for his subsequent life and for the testing of all doctrines presented to him. With Tertullian the *regula fidei* is identical with the *sacramentum fidei*, the rule of faith with that which he so often designates as the oath of allegiance of the soldiers of Christ (*Ad martyras*, iii.). The prevalent view in both these authors is the same as that expressed by Augustine when he says to the catechumens at the *traditio symboli*, "receive, sons, the rule of faith which is called 'the symbol'" (*Serm.*, ccxiii.; *Serm.* i., *ad catechumenos de symbolo*). That similar expressions are occasionally used of the Nicene creed shows at least that the Rule of Faith was a formulated confession, and thus that in the ante-Nicene period it could not refer to anything but the baptismal creed, the only one then existing. In a word, the early Fathers considered Christ himself as the giver of the Rule, though they admitted freely that its actual words were an expansion of the nucleus recorded in the Gospels, regarding it as only a development of the baptismal formula; and, on the other hand, the whole body of teaching current in the undisputed Catholic Church was to them but an expansion of the creed, and thus the term "Rule of Faith" could be, as it is occasionally found, applied to this whole body. (T. Zahn.)

REGULARS: A term used ecclesiastically to denote those of either sex observing a common rule of life and bound by monastic vows. It expresses membership in an order, as opposed to secular, which involves living in the world.

REHOBOAM, rî"hō-bō'am: Son and successor of Solomon, first king of Judah after the division, his own imprudence being in large measure the cause of that division. His dates according to the old chronology were 975–957; according to Kittel 937–920. Sources are I Kings xi. 43–xii. 24, xiv. 21–31; II Chron. ix. 31–xii. The Book of Kings relates that after the death of Solomon, the Israelites went to Shechem to make Reboboam king. Naturally, this does not signify election, since Israel was not strictly an elective monarchy; nevertheless, the people seem to have retained the right to impose conditions under which it would recognize succession. At Shechem, the leaders of the northern tribes demanded a lessening of the burdens imposed upon the people. Rehoboam, at first inclined to consent, was induced to listen to the advice of his younger counselors, and harshly refused; whereupon he was rejected and his rival Jeroboam was chosen in his stead. Although the ostensible reason was the heavy burden laid upon Israel because of Solomon's great outlay for buildings and for luxury of all kinds, the real reason must rather be sought in the inborn opposition between the north and the south. The two sections had acted independently until David (q.v.), by his victories, succeeded in uniting all the tribes, though the Ephraimitic jealousy was ever ready to develop into open revolt. Religious considerations were also operative. The building of the Temple was a severe blow for the various sanctuaries scattered through the land, and the priests of the high places must have supported the revolt. Josephus (*Ant.*, VIII., viii. 3) makes the rebels exclaim: "We leave to Rehoboam the Temple his father built."

Rehoboam's reign was uneventful, and he opposed but a feeble resistance to the revolt of the north. The only event of importance was the campaign of Shishak of Egypt, which occurred in Rehoboam's fifth year and revealed the weakness of divided Irsael. The notice in II Chron. xi. 6 sqq., that Rehoboam built fifteen fortified cities, indicates that the attack was not unexpected. Nevertheless, in spite of its strong position, Jerusalem appears to have offered no serious defense, and the treasures collected by Solomon became the booty of the Egyptians. The cities mentioned in Shishak's inscription at Karnak indicate that his campaign extended beyond Judah, and it seems that Jeroboam was not spared, since the Megiddo of the inscription must be the well-known city of the northern kingdom. Possibly this may signify that Jeroboam, although the instigator of Shishak's invasion, had placed himself under the protectorate of Egypt, and that his cities were regarded by Shishak as his own. W. Spiegelberg regards the Egyptian account as untrustworthy and thinks the accounts of the Old Testament alone reliable (*Aegyptologische Randglossen zum A. T.*, Strasburg, 1904).

(R. Kittel.)

Bibliography: Besides the works on the history of Israel named under Ahab and Israel, History of, consult: F. Vigouroux, *La Bible et les découvertes modernes*, iii. 407–427, Paris, 1896; idem, *Dictionnaire*, fasc. xxxiv. 1102–05; Maspero, in *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute of Great Britain*, xxvii. 63; *DB*, iv. 222–223; *EB*, iv. 4027; *JE*, x. 362–363; and the commentaries on the sources.

REICHEL, rai'shel, **OSWALD JOSEPH:** Church of England; b. at Ockbrook (33 m. s. of Sheffield) Feb. 2, 1840. He received his education at Queen's College, Oxford, where he was Taylorian scholar, Ellerton theological essayist, and Johnson and Denyer theological scholar; was made deacon and priest, 1865; served that year as curate of North Hinckesey, Berkshire; was vice-principal of Cuddesdon College, Oxford, 1865–70; and vicar of Sparsholt with Kingston-Lisle, 1869–86. He translated E. Zeller's *Socrates and the Socratic Schools* (London, 1868), and his *Stoics, Epicureans, and Sceptics* (1870); edited and continued the family tree from documents begun and continued by ancestors in 1620, 1690, 1787, and 1820 (1878); and has written *The Duty of the Church in Respect of Christian Missions* (1866); *The See of Rome in the Middle Ages*

(1870); *Sparsholt Feast* (1883); *English Liturgical Vestments in the Thirteenth Century* (1895); *Solemn Mass at Rome in the Ninth Century* (1895); *A Complete Manual of Canon Law* (2 vols., 1895–96); and a number of brochures on local history and antiquities.

REID, HENRY MARTYN BECKWITH: Scotch Presbyterian; b. at Glasgow Mar. 22, 1856. He was educated at the high school in Dundee and at St. Andrew's University, graduating with honors (M.A., 1877; B.D., 1879); was assistant to the professor of humanity in St. Andrew's, 1878–79; was licensed to preach, 1879, and served as assistant in Anderston Parish, Glasgow, and in Glasgow cathedral, 1881; was ordained minister of Balmaghie, Kirkcudbrightshire, 1882, whence he removed in 1903 to become professor of divinity in the University of Glasgow. Works of his which have interest for theology are: *Lost Habits of the Religious Life* (Edinburgh, 1896); *A Cameronian Apostle. Being some Account of John Macmillan of Balmaghie* (Paisley, 1896); *Books that Help the Religious Life* (Edinburgh, 1897); *Historic Significance of Episcopacy in Scotland* (1899); and *A Country Parish. The Parish as it might be* (1899); *A Scottish School of Theology* (1904); and *Movements of Theological Thought* (1908). He also edited W. Maxwell's *One of King William's Men* (1898) and issued *The Layman's Book* (1900 sqq.).

REID, JOHN MORRISON: Methodist Episcopal; b. in New York May 30, 1820; d. there May 16, 1896. He graduated at the New York University 1839, and Union Theological Seminary, New York, 1844; was principal of Mechanics Institute School, New York, 1839–44; admitted to conference and served in Connecticut, Long Island, and New York, 1844–58; was president of Genesee College, Lima, N. Y., 1858–64; and became editor of the *Western Christian Advocate*, Cincinnati, 1864; of the *Northwestern Christian Advocate*, Chicago, 1868; and corresponding secretary of the Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, New York, 1872. He was the author of *Missions and Missionary Societies of the Methodist Episcopal Church* (2 vols., New York, 1879).

REID, THOMAS: Philosopher; b. at Strachan (19 m. s.w. of Aberdeen), Kincardineshire, Scotland, Apr. 26, 1710; d. at Glasgow Oct. 7, 1796. He graduated at Marischal College, Aberdeen, in 1728, where he was librarian 1733–36; was ordained in 1737, and presented by King's College, Aberdeen, to the living of New Machar twelve miles from the city. He engaged in speculative studies and in 1748 contributed an *Essay upon Quantity*, attacking Francis Hutcheson's application of mathematical formulas to ethical questions. In 1751 he succeeded to the regentship of King's College, which meant the professorship of philosophy, and his lectures included mathematics and physics as well as logic and ethics. In 1758 he was one of the founders of the Philosophical Society which lasted till 1773, and from its discussions and his personal study, especially of the writings of David Hume (q.v.), arose *An Inquiry into the Human Mind, on the Principles of Common Sense* (Edinburgh, 1764), which led to the title, " philosophy of common sense," by which his system and that of his successors came to be known; and also, in 1764, to his election to the professorship of moral philosophy at Glasgow, which he held until his death, lecturing on theology, ethics, political science, and rhetoric.

Starting out with the empiricism of Locke and the philosophy of ideas unsupported by reality as culminating in Hume, Reid went further and claimed that our belief in an external world of space must be accepted as original datum of common sense. " Common sense " was not, however, to be taken as mere vulgar opinion, but as knowledge common to rational beings as such, or the principles of the human understanding. Reid set himself the task of developing a system for the refutation of the skepticism of Hume, against the theory of ideas previously in favor among philosophers. But in doing this he acknowledged that he was indebted to Hume for rousing him to the task of criticizing the popular philosophy, and of endeavoring to replace it by another which could endure the test of skeptical argumentation. His *Inquiry into the Human Mind* is an investigation into the relations of mind to the special senses, dealing in succession with smelling, tasting, hearing, touch, and sight. The work shows that Reid had given considerable attention to the physiology of the senses. His main purpose is to show ample warrant for trusting the information gathered by the senses, and constructing a theory of things by the application of rational principles. Unhappily his favorite phrase, " common sense," is at times used with apparent contradiction, but he means to disavow common sense as called in support of the current philosophy of ideas which had furnished skepticism with its weapons; and, on the other hand, to make common sense the basis of his principles of universal knowledge. Thus he wrote: " In reality, common sense holds nothing of philosophy, nor needs her aid. But, on the other hand, philosophy (if I may be permitted to change the metaphor) has no other root but the principles of common sense " (*Inquiry*, iv.). By this he means that the essential conditions of intelligence are given to all men, so that intellect does not wait on philosophy for warrant of her procedure; while, on the contrary, all sound philosophy must start with unreserved acknowledgment of the principles of intelligence, which he would name " common sense." To find out what these principles are was to him the necessary and most momentous task of a philosophy.

The form of philosophy which Reid had thus described and introduced he further vindicated and developed in his *Essays on the Intellectual Powers of Man* (1785), and *Essays on the Active Powers of Man* (1788). His first and essential position was gained in showing that the use of the senses implies constant exercise of judgment, and that this implies fundamental principles of thought which could be neither demonstrated, disputed, nor dispensed with. His next position was reached in laying open to view certain first principles in reasoning which are essential to intelligence. " The judgment follows the apprehension of them necessarily; and both are equally the work of nature and the result

of our original powers" (*Intellectual Powers*, essay vi., chap. iv.). These are axioms, first principles, prineiples of common sense, common notions, self-evident truths. His third position was reached when he entered the domain of morals, and maintained, in reference to knowledge of moral truths, that there "must be in morals, as in other sciences, first principles which do not derive their evidence from any antecedent principles, but may be said to be intuitively discerned" (*Intellectual Powers*, vii. 2). In treating of judgment as the ruling power in mind, he distinguished two functions: to reason, and to recognize first principles apart from reasoning. "We ascribe to reason two offices or two degrees. The first is to judge of things self-evident; the second is to draw conclusions that are not self-evident from those that are. The first of these is the province, and the sole province, of common sense; and therefore it coincides with reason in its whole extent" (*Intellectual Powers*, vi. 2).

Bibliography: Reid's *Works*, ed. D. Stewart, with *Life*, were published, 4 vols., Edinburgh, 1804, New York, 1822; with notes by G. N. Wright, 2 vols., London, 1843; with preface, notes, etc., by Sir William Hamilton, Edinburgh, 1846, 1858, reissued and ed., H. Mansel, ib. 1863. On the life of Reid, besides D. Stewart, *Account of the Life and Writings of Thomas Reid*, independently, Edinburgh, 1803, and prefixed to most of the editions of the *Works*, consult: A. C. Fraser, *Thomas Reid*, Edinburgh, 1898; *DNB*, xlvii. 436–439. On his philosophy consult: J. Priestley, *An Examination of Dr. Reid's Inquiry into the Human Mind*, London, 1774; [A. Lyall], *A Review of the Principles of Necessary and Contingent Truth in Reference chiefly to the Doctrines of Hume and Reid*, London, 1830; V. Cousin, *Philosophie morale: école écossaise*, Paris, 1840; A. Garnier, *Critique de la philosophie de T Reid*, Paris, 1840; P. H. Mabire, *Philosophique de T Reid. Extraite de ses ouvrages, avec une vie de l'auteur et un essai sur la philosophie écossaise*, Paris, 1844; T. Brown, *Lectures on the Philosophy of the Human Mind*, 20th ed., London, 1860; F. D. Maurice, *Modern Philosophy*, London, 1862; J. McCosh, *Scottish Philosophy*, New York, 1874; L. Stephen, *Hist. of English Thought in the 18th Century*, 2 vols., New York, 1881; L. Dauriac, *Le Réalisme de Reid*, Paris, 1890; M. Kappes, *Der "Common Sense" als Princip der Gewissheit in der Philosophie des Schotten Thomas Reid*, Munich, 1890; G. Seth, *Scottish Philosophy*, 2d ed., Edinburgh, 1890; and the discussions in the works on the history of philosophy.

REID, WILLIAM JAMES: United Presbyterian; b. at South Argyle, Washington County, N. Y., Aug. 17, 1834; d. at Pittsburg, Pa., Sept. 22, 1902. He was graduated at Union College, Schenectady, N. Y., 1855, and at Allegheny Theological Seminary, Pa., 1862; was pastor at Pittsburg from 1862; principal clerk of the General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church after 1875; and corresponding secretary of the United Presbyterian Board of Home Missions, 1868–72. He was the author of *Lectures on the Revelation* (Pittsburg, 1878); and *United Presbyterianism* (1881).

REIFF, rîf **(BEIER, BEYER), LEONHARD:** German Reformer; b. at Munich c. 1495; d. at Küstrin (17 m. n.e. of Frankfort-on-the-Oder) shortly after 1552. He was educated at Wittenberg (1514–1516), and, after entering the Augustinian order, was taken by Luther to the disputation at Heidelberg to defend his teacher's doctrines in forty theses (Apr. 25, 1518). In the autumn of the same year he accompanied Luther to Augsburg, and on Oct. 7 notified Cardinal Cajetan of Luther's arrival, while, after the latter's departure, he presented the cardinal with the Reformer's appeal to the pope (Oct. 20). In 1522 Reiff was sent to Munich with the theses of the Wittenberg Augustinians, only to be placed in close confinement. Liberated at the beginning of 1525, he returned to Wittenberg, whence Luther sent him to Guben in Niederlausitz, where, as pastor, he combated libertinism and endeavored to establish order and morality. In 1531 he resigned his pastorate at Guben, and in the following year was appointed pastor and superintendent at Zwickau. Here his advocacy of the Wittenberg system involved him in many controversies, though he enjoyed the complete confidence of Luther and the elector. In 1538 he, together with Jonas and Spalatin, made a formal visitation at Freiberg, where Reiff remained some time to establish Protestantism. Four years later John Frederick, elector of Saxony, took him with him as a field chaplain in the campaign against Henry of Brunswick, and in 1544 he accompanied the same prince to the Diet of Speyer. When, in 1547, Zwickau passed into the possession of Maurice of Saxony, who made concessions to the emperor regarding the Interim, Reiff resigned and went to the court of Hans, margrave of Brandenburg, at Küstrin, being made pastor of Kottbus (1552) and perhaps superintendent of Küstrin, and during these latter years signalized himself as an opponent of the teachings of Osiander.

G. Bossert.

Bibliography: Sources to be used are the letters of Luther, ed. De Wette and Seidemann, 6 vols., Berlin, 1825–56, and other editions (see under Luther). Consult: G. Bossert, in *Jahrbuch für brandenburgische Kirchengeschichte*, i. 50 sqq.; G. Buchwald, in *Neue sächsische Galerie, Ephorie Zwickau*, Leipsic, 1904.

REIHING, rai'hing, **JAKOB:** German Lutheran; b. at Augsburg Jan. 6, 1579; d. at Tübingen May 5, 1628. He was educated at the Jesuit University of Ingolstadt, and in 1597 became a novice in the Society of Jesus. He taught at Munich and Ingolstadt until 1613, when he was transferred to Dillingen. In the same year he was professed and was then appointed chaplain to the count palatine, Wolfgang Wilhelm, whose conversion to the Roman Catholic faith he justified in his *Muri civitatis sanctæ, hoc est religionis Catholicæ fundamenta duodecim* (Cologne, 1615), *Excubiæ evangelicæ civitatis sanctæ* (1617), and his German *Enchiridion Catholicum*. Reihing gave valuable assistance to the count palatine in the Counter-Reformation in Pfalz-Neuburg, but his own convictions were changed by the sturdy Protestantism of the artizans, by his study of the Bible, and by reading Luther's Postils. On Jan. 15, 1621, he fled to Stuttgart, where he was examined for four days, after which he was sent to Tübingen. There, on Nov. 23, 1621, he formally renounced his former faith, publishing his reasons in his *Laquei pontificii contriti* (Tübingen, 1621). The Roman Catholics sought to win him back by flattering promises, but when these failed, they attacked him with unfounded charges and with scurrilous pamphlets. Reihing was now appointed assistant professor of polemics at Tübingen, where he became full professor of theology, as well as superintendent of the theological seminary, in 1625.

holding both these positions until his death, three years later. G. BOSSERT.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: The funeral sermon by Lukas Osiander, Tübingen, 1628; J. M. Rauscher, *Laudatio funebris*, ib. 1629; Oehler, in *Der wahre Protestant*, iii. 1 (1854), which is of high value; *ADB*, xxvii. 698–700.

REIMARUS, HERMANN SAMUEL. See WOLFENBUETTEL FRAGMENTS.

REIMS NEW TESTAMENT. See BIBLE VERSIONS, B, IV., § 5.

REINECCIUS, rai-nec'î-us **(RENECCIUS), JAKOB:** German Lutheran; b. at Salzwedel (54 m. n.n.w. of Magdeburg) 1572 (1571); d. at Hamburg June 28, 1613. He was educated at Wittenberg, and after being pastor at Tangermünde, was called, in 1601, to St. Peter's, Berlin, as pastor and provost. In 1609 he was installed as pastor of St. Catherine's, Hamburg, and after 1612 was also inspector of a new gymnasium erected at Hamburg. His chief writings, besides collections of sermons, were as follows: *Panoplia sive armatura theologica* (Wittenberg, 1609); *Clavis sacræ theologiæ* (2 vols., Hamburg, 1611); *Fragstücke vom heiligen Abendmahl* (1611); *Veteris ac Novi Testamenti convenientia et differentia* (1612); *Calvinianorum ortus, cursus et exitus* (1612); *Theologiæ libri duo* (1613); *Veræ ecclesiæ inventio et dispositio* (1613); *Justum Christi tribunal* (1613); and the posthumous *Epistola contra fœdera* (Rostock, 1625).

(KARL RUDOLF KLOSE†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: H. Schröder, *Lexikon der Hamburger Schriftsteller*, vi. 212 sqq., Hamburg, 1883.

REINHARD, rain'hart, **FRANZ VOLKMAR:** German Lutheran; b. at Vohenstrauss (42 m. n.e. of Regensburg) Mar 12, 1753; d. at Dresden Sept. 6, 1812. He was educated at the University of Wittenberg, where he became privat-docent for philosophy and philology in 1777, being appointed associate professor of philosophy in 1780 and full professor of theology in 1782, still retaining his philosophical courses. In 1784 he was also made provost of the castle and university church, as well as assessor in the Wittenberg consistory. He declined a call to the University of Helmstedt in 1790, but two years later accepted an invitation to become chief court chaplain, ecclesiastical councilor, and member of the supreme consistory at Dresden. Despite the existence of serious doubts during his career as a university professor, he became one of the leaders of the supernaturalistic school, which sought not only to oppose the rationalism of the period and to defend the divine supremacy and authority of the Bible, but also to prove the truth of divine revelation by psychologically intelligible demonstration and to bring it into harmony with the demands of reason. Both in his dogmatic lectures and in his sermons he sought to establish the truth of Lutheranism by rationalistic arguments, but as a pulpit orator he won wide fame throughout Germany, and at the same time exercised a powerful influence on Saxony, since, as ecclesiastical councilor and member of the consistory, he also supervised the appointment of teachers in the universities and seminaries. With advancing years, especially in the second half of his Dresden activity, he advanced to a deeper sense of Christianity and to a more profound conviction of justification solely by the grace of Christ as the center of Christian doctrine; and after 1805 his themes dealt no longer with mere imperfections and moral weaknesses, but with sins and vices, with Christ as the sole mediator between God and man. Reinhard was the main factor in introducing an improved system of pericopes in the Saxon church with a consequent raising of the standard of preaching. A most prolific author, his sermons were collected in thirty-nine volumes (Sulzbach, 1793–1837), and mention should also be made of his *System der christlichen Moral* (5 vols., Wittenberg, 1788–1815); *Versuch über den Plan, welchen der Stifter der christlichen Religion . entwarf* (1798; Eng. transl., *Plan of the Founder of Christianity*, by O. A. Taylor, from the fifth German edition, New York, 1831); *Vorlesungen über die Dogmatik* (ed. J. G. J. Berg, Sulzbach, 1806); and *Geständnisse meine Predigten und meine Bildung zum Prediger betreffend* (1810; Eng. transl., under the title *Memoirs and Confessions*, by O. A. Taylor, Boston, 1832).

(DAVID ERDMANN†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Sketches of the *life* were written by K. H. L. Pölitz, Leipsic, 1813; F. A. Köthe, Jena, 1812; K. A. Böttiger, Dresden, 1813; M. F. Scheibler, Leipsic, 1823; and in *ADB*, xxviii. 32–33. Consult also F. Dibelius, *Beiträge zur sächsischen Kirchengeschichte*, vii. 90–91, Leipsic, 1892.

REINKENS, JOSEPH HUBERT: First bishop of the Old Catholics; b. at Burtscheidt (now part of Aachen) Mar. 1, 1821; d. at Bonn Jan. 5, 1896. He was educated at the University of Bonn (1844–1847) and the theological seminary at Cologne (1847–48), and, after ordination to the Roman Catholic priesthood in 1848, resumed his studies at Bonn (Th.D., Munich, 1849). In 1850 he went to Breslau as privat-docent for church history, and published his *De Clemente presbytero Alexandrino* (Breslau, 1851). He was appointed associate professor in 1853, this period being marked by his *Clemens von Rom und andere Legenden* (Breslau, 1855) and *Das Sommerkind, oder der Grund der Völkerwanderung* (Paderborn, 1858). In 1857 Reinkens was promoted to a full professorship, but he now began to give evidence of views differing from the official position of his communion in his attack on Thomism, entitled *Vademecum oder die römisch-katholische Lehre von der Anthropologie*, published under the pseudonym of Christian Franke (Giessen, 1860). He was likewise charged with maligning the Silesian clergy in his *Die Universität Breslau vor der Vereinigung mit der Frankfurter* (Breslau, 1861), though he succeeded in proving the accusation false. On the other hand he also wrote during this professorial period his *Hilarius von Poitiers* (Schaffhausen, 1864); *Die Einsiedler des heiligen Hieronymus* (1864); and *Martin von Tours* (Breslau, 1866). Meanwhile his health was failing, and in 1867 it became necessary for him to obtain leave of absence for a year. He was for a time in Munich, Venice, and Florence, but his longest residence was at Rome, only to be confirmed in his distrust of the aims, methods, and conditions of the Curia. He returned to Germany and plunged

into work for distraction, in this spirit producing his *Aristoteles über Kunst, besonders über Tragödie* (Vienna, 1870); but the pronouncement of the dogma of papal infallibility (see INFALLIBILITY OF THE POPE; VATICAN COUNCIL) had brought matters to a crisis, and Reinkens endeavored to assist the minority who protested against the new decrees by writing his *Papst und Papsttum nach der Zeichnung des heiligen Bernard von Clairvaux* (Münster, 1870), following this with his *Ueber die päpstliche Unfehlbarkeit* (Munich, 1870). Despite all prohibitions, Reinkens persisted in his course of opposition to the decrees of the Vatican Council both in writing and in counsel, and attendance on his lectures was accordingly forbidden. On Nov. 20, 1870, he was finally suspended by the prince-bishop of Breslau.

In the years following Reinkens, residing partly at Munich and partly on the Rhine, attended Old Catholic congresses and lectured far and wide in behalf of the movement. In 1872 he made the journey to Switzerland which resulted in the establishment of the Old Catholics there, and in the following year he was elected bishop of the new organization. He was consecrated by the Jansenist bishop of Deventer, Heykamp, on Aug. 11, 1873, and was recognized by Prussia on Sept. 19, by Baden on Nov. 7, and by Hesse on Dec. 15. Bavaria, on the other hand, refused to recognize him, and on Nov. 21 the Old Catholics and their bishop were excommunicated by the pope. The sympathy with the movement felt by the theological faculty of Bonn led Reinkens to take up his residence in that city. He presided over fourteen synods held in different parts of Germany, in which many sweeping departures from the Roman Catholic system were introduced (see, in general, OLD CATHOLICS). He was continually active in episcopal visitations throughout a diocese stretching from Königsberg in the northeast to Constance in the southwest, and from Krefeld in the northwest to Silesia and Passau in the southeast. He lived to see a steady growth in clergy, parishes, and communicants, and he founded at Bonn a seminary for candidates for the priesthood. He likewise was a potent factor in keeping the Old Catholics from falling into the perils of German Catholicism (q.v.), and he steadily resisted all efforts to induce him to be reconciled with the Roman Catholic Church. In 1895 failing health forced him to ask for a coadjutor, and Theodor Weber was accordingly consecrated.

Besides the works already mentioned, Reinkens wrote, among others, the following: *Die barmherzigen Schwestern vom heiligen Carl Borromeo zu Nancy* (2d ed., Schaffhausen, 1855); *Revolution und Kirche* (Bonn, 1876); *Luise Hensel und ihre Lieder* (1877); *Amalie von Lasaulx eine Bekennerin* (1878); *Melchior von Diepenbrock* (Leipsic, 1883); and *Lessing über Toleranz* (1883). He was likewise the author of many sermons and of fourteen episcopal charges. English translations have appeared of his *First Pastoral Letter (11 Aug. 1873) and Speech on Bible Reading*, by G. E. Broade (London, 1874), and of his *Speeches on Christian Union and Old Catholic Prospects*, by J. E. B. Mayor (1874).

(J. REINKENS†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: J. M. Reinkens, *Joseph Hubert Reinkens*, Gotha, 1906; F. Rolert, *Bischof Reinkens und seine Helfer*, Leipsic, 1888; W. Beyschlag, *Bischof Reinkens und der deutsche Altkatholizismus*, Berlin, 1896; F. Nippold, *Erinnerungen an Bischof Reinkens*, Leipsic, 1896; and the literature under OLD CATHOLICS.

REISCHLE, raɪ'shle, **MAX WILHELM THEODOR:** German Protestant; b. in Vienna June 18, 1858; d. at Halle Dec. 11, 1905. He was educated at the universities of Tübingen (1876–80), Göttingen, and Berlin (1882–83), interrupting his studies while vicar at Gmünd, Württemberg, in 1881–82. He was a lecturer at the theological seminary at Tübingen (1883–88), having official permission to lecture in the university of the same city. He was then a teacher in a gymnasium at Stuttgart (1888–1892); professor of practical theology at the University of Giessen (1892–95); was called to Göttingen as professor of systematic theology (1895); and in the same capacity to the University of Halle (1896). In theology he belonged to the school of Ritschl. He wrote: *Ein Wort zur Kontroverse über die Mystik in der Theologie* (Freiburg, 1886); *Die Frage nach dem Wesen der Religion, Grundlegung zu einer Methodologie der Religionsphilosophie* (1889); *Das akademische Studium und der Kampf um die Weltanschauung* (Göttingen, 1894); *Die Spielen der Kinder in seinem Erziehungswert* (1897); *Christliche Glaubenslehre in Leitsätzen für eine akademische Vorlesung entwickelt* (Halle, 1899); *Welturteile und Glaubensurteile* (1900); *Jesu Worte von der ewigen Bestimmung der Menschenseele in religionsgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung* (1902); *Theologie und Religionsgeschichte* (Tübingen, 1904); and the posthumous *Aufsätze und Vorträge*, ed. T. Häring and F. Loofs (1906), contains biographical introduction.

REITZ, raɪts, **JOHANN HEINRICH:** German Reformed and mystic; b. at Oberdiebach (a village near Bacharach, 22 m. s.s.e. of Coblenz) 1655; d. at Wesel (32 m. n.w. of Düsseldorf) Nov. 25, 1720. He was educated at Leyden and Bremen, in the latter city coming under pietistic influences. Completing his studies at Heidelberg, he taught at Frankenthal, until 1681, when he was called to the pastorate of Freinsheim. Here he remained until compelled to flee by the War of the Palatinate in 1689, and during this first pastorate completed his Latin translation of the *Moses and Aaron* of Thomas Godwin (Bremen, 1684). He then became inspector of churches and schools in the district of Ladenburg, only again to be driven out by war. He next preached for a time at Asslar, and a few years later was made inspector at Braunfels. Here, however, his attempt to convert a mystic to the ways of faith led to his own fall from orthodoxy, and he was deposed and expelled. For a time he was pastor at Homberg-vor-der-Höhe, and then went to Frankfort, justifying his tenets in his *Kurtzer Begriff des Leidens, der Lehre und des Verhaltens J. H. Reitzens* (Offenbach, 1698), manifesting a mixture of Reformed orthodoxy and chiliasm. He now wandered about with other enthusiasts, founding "Philadelphian" societies, and enjoying the favor of noble sympathizers. For some three years he resided at Offenbach, attacking the Heidelberg Catechism in his *Kurtzer Vortrag von der Gerechtigkeit, die wir*

auss und in Jehova durch den Glauben haben (n.p., 1701) and preparing a translation of the New Testament (Offenbach, 1703) which was colored by his peculiar views. In 1702–04 he was director of a Reformed Latin school at Siegen, but was removed for attending meetings for private devotion. He then wandered for some years from place to place, finally becoming administrator for the widowed princess of Nassau-Siegen, then residing at her castle of Wisch, near Terborg. Finally, in 1711, he went to Wesel, where, having wearied of his former extravagances and returned to orthodoxy, he set up a successful Latin school, over which he presided until his death.

The chief work of Reitz was his collection of brief biographies entitled *Historie der Wiedergeborenen* (7 parts, 3d ed., Berleburg, 1724–46), and his writings also include: *Geöffneter Himmel, Erklärung der sonderbaren Geheimnisse des Himmelreichs* (Wetzlar, 1707); and the posthumous *Nachfolge Jesu Christi* (Leipsic, 1730) and *Verborgene Offenbarung Jesu Christi aus dreien Büchern, der inneren und äusseren Natur, und der Schrift erklärt* (Frankfort, 1738). In all these wide scope is given to the "inner light," as among the Anabaptists and Quakers, as well as, under the influence of Cocceius, to contempt of the observance of Sunday and disparagement of the Old Testament. Creeds and an ordained ministry are also lightly regarded as secondary in importance, restorationism is taught, all sorts of mystical ideas are advanced, and it is maintained that Christ assumed, not the flesh of the first Adam, but, as Paul taught, the peccable nature of fallen man.

(F. W Cunoth.)

Bibliography: M. Göbel, *Geschichte des christlichen Lebens in der rheinisch-westphälischen evangelischen Kirche*, vol. ii., Coblentz, 1852; C. W. H. Hochhuth, *H. Horche und die philadelph. Gemeinden in Hessen*, Gütersloh, 1876; F. W. Cuno, *Gedächtnisbuch deutscher Fürsten und Fürstinnen reformirten Bekenntnisses*, vol. ii., Barmen, 1883; E. Sachsse, *Ursprung und Wesen des Pietismus*, Wiesbaden, 1884; T. Gümbel, *Geschichte der protestantischen Kirche der Pfalz*, Kaiserslohn, 1885.

RELAND (REELAND, RELANT), ADRIAN: Dutch orientalist and geographer; b. at Rijp (a village near Alkmaar, 20 m. n.n.w. of Amsterdam) July 17, 1676; d. at Utrecht Feb. 5, 1718. He was educated at Amsterdam (1686–88) and Utrecht (1688–93), completing his studies at Leyden. In 1699 he was appointed professor of physics and metaphysics at Harderwijk, but in the following year was called to Utrecht as professor of oriental languages and sacred antiquities, retaining this chair until his death. His studies ranged over classical philology, Persian and Arabic literature, the languages of India and Farther India, China, Japan, and South America. He devoted special attention, however, to the Bible and cognate subjects. His writings of theological interest were as follows: *Analecta Rabbinica* (Utrecht, 1702); *Antiquitates sacræ veterum Hebræorum* (1708); *Dissertationes quinque de nummis veterum Hebræorum qui ab inscriptarum literarum forma Samaritani appellantur* (1709); *Palæstina ex monumentis veteribus illustrata* (1714); and *De spoliis templi Hierosoymitani in arcu Titiano* (1716), as well as a number of essays in his *Dissertationes miscellaneæ* (3 parts, 1706–08). The *Palæstina* is still indispensable. He was the author also of the *De religione Mohammedica libri duo* (Utrecht, 1705; Eng. transl. by A. Bobovius, 3 parts, London, 1712). (H. Guthe.)

Bibliography: Niceron, *Mémoires*, i. 339–349, x. 62–63; K. Burmann, *Trajectum eruditum*, pp. 293–301, Utrecht, 1738; L. G. Michaud, *Biographie universelle*, xxxvii. 308–311, Paris, 1824 sqq.; A. J. Van der Aa, *Biographisch Woordenboek der Nederlanden*, x. 45–47, Haarlem, 1874; R. Röhricht, *Bibliotheca geographica Palastinæ*, pp. 296–297, Berlin, 1890.

RELIC: The body, or some part of the same, of a saint, or an object supposed to have been connected with the life and person of Christ, a saint, or a martyr, and preserved for religious veneration, especially in the Roman Catholic and Eastern Churches. The term was received from the classical Latin meaning "remains from dead bodies" (*reliquiæ* = "ashes"), and was applied to relics from the martyrs. Later it was extended to include the bodies themselves (*Vita Sancti Maxentii; ASM*, i. 567) and everything that had come into contact with the saints or their bodies (Gregory the Great, *Dialogorum*, II., xxxviii.). In "The Epist. of the church at Smyrna concerning the martyrdom of Polycarp" (xviii.; Eng. transl., *ANF*, i. 43) the bones of the martyr, after the body was consumed in the fire, are represented as "more precious than the most exquisite jewels, and more refined than gold" and (xvii.; Eng. transl., i. 42) many "desired to become possessors of his holy flesh." In the next century Cyprian and Dionysius of Alexandria bear witness that congregations considered it their right and duty to bury the bodies of their martyrs (Cyprian, *Epist.*, viii. 3, xii. 1; Eng. transl., *ANF*, v. 281, 315; Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, vii. 11, 22; Eng. transl., *NPNF*, ser. 2, i. 301, 307). The possession of the body, or at least the relics, was taken as securing a continuation of fellowship with the deceased. This view throws light upon the custom of assembling at the graves of the martyrs to celebrate the agape and the Eucharist (*Epist. de martyrio Polycarpi*, xviii.; Eng. transl., *ANF*, i. 43; Cyprian, *Epist.*, xxxix. 3; Eng. transl., *ANF*, v. 313), and of the desire for burial in the vicinity of the martyr. The aversion to touching the bodies of the dead apropos of the survival of the ceremonial law of the Jews could not long impede this development.

The transition from the veneration of entombed bodies to that of relics occurred during the latter half of the third and the beginning of the fourth centuries, and evidently falls into connection with the persecutions under Decius, Valerian, and Diocletian. In Egypt the dead bodies of saints were not buried but retained for veneration in the houses (*Vita Antonii magni*, xc.; *ASB*, ii. 120–141). Optatus (*De schismate Donatistarum*, i. 16) speaks of a certain Lucilla of Carthage, who kissed the bone of a martyr; and of the Christians at Tarragona it is said that after the death of Fructuosus (q.v.) and his associates each one appropriated, so far as possible, some of their ashes (*Acta Fructuosi*, vi.; *ASB*, ii. 339–341). In each of those three instances the act was disapproved by the church leaders, but in spite of this the veneration became general. In addition it was soon believed that the inanimate

body had miraculous virtue, acquired by the long habitation of the soul. Egypt, particularly, seemed to have been a rich treasure-house of these objects. The church in Jerusalem was famed for possessing the chair of James (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, vii. 19; Eng. transl., *NPNF*, 2 ser., i. 305) and a remnant of the oil miraculously multiplied by Bishop Narcissus (Eusebius, ut sup., vi. 9; Eng. transl., i. 255).

The advance to superstitious veneration occurred principally in the period of Constantine; and the bringing of the relics of Timothy, Andrew, and Luke to Constantinople (356–357) points to the transference of relics as begun under Constantius. At this time appears the practise, instead of burying the remains of martyrs, of dividing them for wider distribution (Gregory of Nyssa, in his third address on the forty martyrs; *MPG*, xlvi. 783). The Greek authorities of this and the next period are unanimous in commending the religious veneration of relics. In the West Ambrose brought to light the relics of Protasius and Gervasius, which was the beginning of a series of similar discoveries and translations. Jerome and Paulinus of Nola particularly promoted this form of piety, the latter almost to the borders of creature-worship (" a local star and a cure," *Poemata*, xix. 14, xxvii. 443). Nothing indicates better the broadcast possession of these objects than the frequent mention of forged relics. However, there was no lack of protests, at least against accretions. Pope Damasus discredited the effort to obtain burial near the tombs of martyrs. The rescript of Theodosius for the protection of the bodies of martyrs was ineffectual in the East; in the West Gregory the Great, in a letter (*Epist.*, iv. 30; Eng. transl. in *NPNF*, 2 ser. xii. 154–156) to the Empress Constantina, declared that the practise in the East of touching and removing the bodies of martyrs must be taken as sacrilege, and that permission was given only to bring cloths to the tombs with which to touch the bodies, and that these cloths were henceforth relics. While parts of the bodies of saints appear here and there in the West; yet the dismemberment of bodies was openly censured. In general it may be assumed that the majority of relics in the West at this time consisted of memorials of the graves and places of the saints supposed to be endowed with miraculous and sanctifying virtues; such as, parts of clothing, a key from the tomb of Peter, and water from their wells. This restriction, however, could not be maintained against the popular demand. In the ninth century most relics were bodies or parts of them, and the Synod of Mainz (813; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, iii. 763, canon 5), which renewed the prohibition against removals, sanctioned the permission given by rulers, bishops, and synods. The Church promoted the veneration by the decision that relics shall be deposited within every altar.

The beginning of the collocation of martyr's tomb and church can not be traced farther back than the fourth century, when the churches of St. Peter and St. Paul appeared upon the sites of " the trophies of the apostles " at the Vatican and the Ostian way (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.*, ii. 25; Eng. transl., *NPNF*, 2 ser., i. 130). Ambrose refused consecration to churches without relics and Pope Severinus (640) collected them in great numbers for the border churches on the Danube. The seventh ecumenical council (Nicea, 787) forbade the bishops to consecrate churches without relics under penalty of excommunication. The English Synod of Celchyt (816) allowed exceptions (Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, iii. 580); yet the more relics multiplied, the less frequently the exceptions occurred, so that the Synod of Mainz (888) presupposed also relics in portable altars. The belief that the relics are instruments of divinely wrought miracles still firmly prevails in the Roman Catholic Church (Council of Trent, xxv. 469). (A. Hauck.)

While the principle of veneration of Christian relics is not derived from ethnic practise, the diffusion of the custom reflects a profound sense of regard for men who have served their race in religious development. Thus it is reported that Gautama's body was burned and the relics, apportioned among his disciples, were widely dispersed, of which the "Stupas" (q.v.) are monuments. India may be called the home of relics, a large proportion of its smaller shrines being built around objects of this class. The cult is found even in Mohammedanism, in spite of its rigid monotheism, and was an occasion of the rise of the Wahabis and an object of attack by them.—G. W. G.

Bibliography: Early treatises are: Guibert of Nogent, in *MPL*, clvi. 607–609, cf. A. Lefranc, in *Études d'hist. du moyen âge, dediées à Gabriel Monod*, Paris, 1896; Peter the Venerable, *De miraculis*, in *MPL*, clxxxix. A very useful and comprehensive treatment is to be found in *DCA*, ii. 1768–85. Consult further: J. Launoy, *De cura ecclesiæ pro sanctis et sanctorum reliquiis*, Paris, 1660; J. Mabillon, *Lettre d'un Bénédictin touchant le discernement des anciennes reliques*, ib. 1700; G. de Cordemoy, *Traité des saintes reliques*, ib. 1719; J. A. S. C. de Plancy, *Dictionnaire critique des reliques*, ib. 1821; E. S. Hartshorne, *Enshrined Hearts*, London, 1861; P. Parfait, *La Foire aux reliques*, Paris, 1879; S. Beissel, *Die Verehrung der Heiligen und ihrer Reliquien in Deutschland*, Freiburg, 1890; P. Vignon, *The Shroud of Christ*, New York, 1903; H. Siebert, *Beiträge zur vorreformatorischen Heiligen- und Reliquienverehrung*, Freiburg, 1907; F. Pfister, *Der Reliquenkult im Altertum. 1. Das objekt des Relinquenkults*, Giessen, 1909; Schaff, *Christian Church*, v. 1, pp. 844 sqq.; *KL*, x. 1030–41. For interesting lists of relics consult: Gelenius, *De admiranda sacra et civili magnitudine, Coloniæ*, Cologne, 1645; Mai, *Nova collectio*, i. 37–52; H. Canisius, *Thesaurus monumentorum*, III., ii. 214 sqq., Antwerp, 1725.

RELIEF ACT: An act of parliament passed in 1791 (31 George III. c. 32) relieving Roman Catholics of certain political, educational, and economic disabilities. It admitted Roman Catholics to the practise of law, permitted the exercise of their religion, and the existence of their schools, relieved them of the oath of supremacy and declaration against transubstantiation and of the necessity of enrolling deeds and wills. On the other hand, chapels, schools, officiating priests and teachers were to be registered, assemblies with locked doors, as well as steeples and bells to chapels, were forbidden; priests were not to wear their robes or to hold service in the open air; children of Protestants might not be admitted to the schools; monastic orders and endowments of schools and colleges were prohibited.

Bibliography: J. H. Overton and F. Relton, *The English Church (1714–1800)*, pp. 226–227, London, 1906.

RELIEF SYNOD. See Presbyterians, I.

RELIGION.

I. General Treatment.
Inner Experience Necessary (§ 1).
Science of Religion Possible? (§ 2).
Comparative Method (§ 3).
Introspection (§ 4).
Telic Consciousness; Freedom (§ 5).
Religion and God (§ 6).
Regeneration (§ 7).
Summary (§ 8).
II. Special Methods of Study.
Possible Modes of Studying Religion (§ 1).
History of Religion (§ 2).
Science of Religion (§ 3).
Psychology of Religion (§ 4).
Philosophy of Religion (§ 5).

I. General Treatment: A knowledge of religion can express only the individual's participation in it. Those to whom it is foreign will either confess ignorance of it, or will declare it to be an illusion, to be resisted or used. If it be regarded as an illusion, it is taken as an accumulation of human fears and as the cultivation of such delusions in order to conceal the fate producing them. This explanation finds support in the fact that the reality of which religion speaks is not to be discovered in the experience before whose necessities human aspiration and concern must remain silent. It can also not be concealed that religion, while transcending this experience accessible to all, is intimately connected with inner human needs. Naturally the charge that religion originates from them is regarded by religion itself as a hostile act; but to refute it with arguments so as to convince every one is not possible. It is not even desirable; for were this possible, an antithesis upon which the life of religion itself depends would disappear; the antithesis of its mystery with the profane. However, religion can otherwise meet the effort to reduce it to an illusion. Where realized as an awakening from illusions, its purpose to be unreservedly veracious can not remain unrecognized in its environment. It fortifies itself outwardly by acquiring inner firmness and clearness, capable of challenging from without inquiry concerning its truth. It can then make reply to everyone who states that religion is an illusion of human necessity by saying that he fails to know its real life. Those who prefer to regard religion as either conscious or unconscious self-deception are not to be convinced by argument; but all those who have experienced religion as an internal conquest of self-deception stand on the common ground of possessing, and of being capable of possessing, knowledge of religion. Religion can be apprehended only by participating in it. In this respect it is no worse off than every purely historical phenomenon, whose origin, unlike a simple fact of nature, can not be pursued farther than to the inner processes in particular individuals. Such a phenomenon can be grasped only as one coexperiences the inner processes in which it is rooted. As a parallel, he who from native resources is incapable of contributing to the creation of the state, is unable to know what the state is. This is preeminently characteristic of religion, which will appear the more evident the more the source of its vital energy is discovered in contrast with all other historical phenomena.

1. Inner Experience Necessary.

It is true of religion beyond all other empirical life that it affords no objective perception. Historical phenomena, however, approximate the objectivity of demonstrable reality in proportion as, in their origin, universally disseminated and tangible psychological tendencies of the human soul-life cooperate. This is true, in a high degree, of the State, for by those who come to regard the same as an illusion of despotism, not only are their active interest and a sense of the dignity of the State sacrificed, but in addition certain natural tendencies exercised in political conduct. Religion in its realization makes requisition upon all the motives of life, but that in which it enters life can not be apprehended as a product of those powers and is to be viewed only as an incident. The field of religious perception is therefore introspection, and to deduce the nature of religion from the comparison of a multitude of examples results in self-deception. For, first, no one to whose life religion is foreign can possibly realize how it determines in others the character to assert itself. Secondly, he who is religiously conscious can only rediscover in others traces of his own, perhaps retarded or transposed, perhaps developed in a degree impossible to him. He who could properly estimate the religions in history would have to possess a view of his own, unsatisfiable by anything else. But if such has grown out of his own religious life only and he can not impart it in the form in which he possesses it, there is no possibility for a science of religion. For science is the knowledge of an objective or demonstrable actuality. But neither what religion proposes to be for itself nor the actuality which it envelops is so constituted that others can be led by proof to perceive anything in it but suppositions. This opinion of the situation begins to spread at the present time. Striking is its appearance in that quarter where an effort is held forth to produce an assumed science of religion; i.e., in comparative religion. One of its advocates remarks as follows: "It is self-evident that a real understanding of religion is only possible if the different religions are studied entirely impartially and purely from the historical standpoint" (E. Troeltsch, *Die Philosophie im Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts*, i. 134, 1904). "Impartial" study is here utterly impossible; for what religion presumes to be, or the reality it asserts, is evident only to him who in his own existence attains to religious life. His own religious self-existence is filled in every impulse with an incommunicable conviction. A man thus knowing religion in the reality asserted by itself, opposed to others in his personal conviction, is from the outset partizan, and is qualified for the inner fellowship which unites human beings altogether differently from the grouping of objective perception, or science. If, for instance, in the attempt at comparative generalization the various elements of simple supernaturalism of all religions be disregarded, the

2. Science of Religion Possible?

philosophy of religion has on the whole lost its subject. But if upon the assumed science of religion be imposed the recognition of all these in any other sense than psychological fact, namely, in the sense of thoughts arising from inner conviction, and if religion is treated in accordance with what it claims to be, the result is no longer science, whose deductions are universally accepted, where the powers of intellectual culture have developed, but theology, which, by means of scientific logic, seeks to describe and clarify the religious content prevalent within a particular life-circle. The philosophy of religion that would be adequate to religion is from the outset theology; for no one released from his own individual position can have a conception of the reality of religion.

A correct sense of the essence of religion contracts considerably the significance of comparative religious history. If religion appears to us only by what it self-evidently is in us, no solution can be expected by a retrospect of historical examples of religions so-called. So much is admitted. But not so much the religious processes as the primitive forms of religion are to be determined, and types abstracted from these are to afford the understanding of the higher religions. That little was to be accomplished over against the higher religions with the categories of the history of religion as hitherto wrought out from the materials of primitive forms is not surprising, seeing that whoever would understand and estimate religion must first know its natural and intact reality. But it is likewise admitted that such research is unconcerned about what religion is in itself, what phenomena are primary, what secondary, or what have nothing to do with religion. A science that contents itself thus can only incidentally contribute anything to throw light on religion of the higher order, and the acknowledgment that it has accomplished little to this effect is not unexpected. It is also difficult to perceive how a collection of ethnological material, the original significance of which is unknown, can ever provide safe contributions to the understanding of religion. The history of religion can not establish the understanding of religion, for this it presupposes. If it thus fails, it reduces itself to a mere collection of ethnological curios. He who by virtue of his own religious life can view that of others may become aware of the limitations of his own; but the analysis of a religious manifestation in another can not furnish him with the understanding of religion on the whole, much less can the pursuit of highly improbable generalities among the remnants of primitive development. Whoever attempts to make religion an object of scientific knowledge or to include it in the demonstrable reality of things, has either no clear idea of religion or does not know what science is. All that science touches is dead.* Religion is life. It is absurd that one should experience the reality of the living spirit and then surrender this to science, which it transcends, as if it did not deserve real worth until science had passed it through its process. In biology just as soon as life is treated within the scope of conceivable reality it has ceased to be life and has become mechanism; so with religion. Personal piety does not originate from an heirloom, but is vital in its origin. To aim to apprehend it in a categorical correlation with another is to annul it for oneself.

3. Comparative Method.

The first thing encountered in an examination of subjective experience is its state of concealment. The field of inquiry is, for the pious, his inner life, and the community where individuals of similar inner experience approach each other in confidence. Religion is actual only in the examination of inner states in which the subject distinguishes himself from the world of experience, which is correlated by law and admissible to all. This takes place by attention to the inner processes which afford a sense of the self-existence and exclusiveness of the subjective life. The intuition of the inner life is made possible by the desire for self-expression. In the exercise of will the conscious living being distinguishes between that which it includes with its self-existence and that which it deducts from self, so as to be aware of that activity and of that which it puts in relation with itself; therefore in its fear and hope, in its hate and love, the human subject obtains a perception of its inner life. In this inner private order, in distinction from the universal outer order, the fact of religion is to be sought. This does not mean that religion is the product of the desire of self-assertion; no man is pious who includes self-seeking in what he regards as religion. Genuine piety involves voluntary passiveness to truth and reality. Religion can not arise from desire but from the recognition of the actual, or knowledge. Here begins also science; but no scientific knowledge however sublimated can belong to the forces of the religious life; for that lies in the open light, this wells up in the undisclosed. But the knowledge in which only religion can subsist is of a peculiar kind. It is not the apprehension of the objectively actual but reflection upon subjective experience. The disadvantage appears here over against objective knowledge, in that conformity with law in relation to the latter facilitates the discrimination of truth from appearance. As to the former, on the contrary, there is no method of discrimination that may illustrate itself by comparison with others, for there is no formal unity of the representations according to law, such as obtains for the universal. Only this remains to consider, how the clear certainty of genuine experiences springs up, which is capable of guarding against evanishment in the further development of life. To promote this, it is not necessary as in objective cognition to set bounds to the will of self-expression so that cognition be not interfered with, for the activity of this volition alone creates scope for subjective experience; but security against deception is to be gained here in that the will of self-expression becomes really true in itself.

4. Introspection.

* Is not botany a science, and do not flowers live? Similarly it may be remarked that anthropology is a science, and so of other branches of knowledge. Modern opinion is decidedly trending against the assumption that the application of scientific study to religion is either barred or impossible. Indeed, theologians are growing more favorable to science as furnishing aid in establishing a firmer basis for theology.

The veritableness of volition or desire consists in the unchangeableness of the end or aim assumed by the conscious willing subject out of its own knowledge. A real willing occurs only where the subject connotes all that he undertakes in time in a supreme voluntary act which possesses an eternal end. But in no momentary act of self-expression can the individual regard his existence as eternally warranted; hence in every act of will another element acts in combination with the impulse, namely, the consciousness of its final object. The abstraction from momentary self-existence and concentration upon the eternal purpose reflects the dawn of the consciousness of the human will unchangeable. An inner life of a higher order with an imperishable content is the result. This will grounded upon the eternally valid is the ethical sense. In the true willing of the ethical, positive self-denial becomes self-expression. What is directly willed is not the life of the soul, but the overcoming of mere appearance in obedience to the truth and in the tendency of the telic aim. The first impulses of ethical perception lead the soul toward the consciousness of freedom. This is attained not in a state of individual seclusion but in society amid the stream of historical life. Contact with morally awakened fellow beings stimulates confidence and respect, the experience of which is the dawn of moral perception in every human being. A true power of will is born in him who, in the experience of a love which concerns itself for him, becomes conscious of a state of life in men, imperceptible to sense, and has confidence in them. But in this the capacity of religious experience has come into being. When that is earnestly practised which is given in this conduct of trust, there is a sense of being possessed of a power affording an experience of something otherwise entirely remote. This wonder has oftentimes been conceived and described in its glory. Wherever religion has given itself expression the wonder has at least been touched upon. The incomparable boon given in the impulse of trust is the inner situation in which the human subject may be wholly overwhelmed. Men in whom this is not possible are isolated by their inner exclusiveness. It is a rescue from darkness to approach a power that has open access to the soul. This takes place the moment in which one bows in trust and reverence before the beneficence of a personality, which becomes noticeable by the act of transfixing one in the motive of those impulses. Release from deadly isolation, or unfree selfishness, is possible if in trust in a person one becomes conscious of him so as to impose an unconditional requirement upon himself. Naturally one confides in another only so far as the other inspires the conviction that he is not self-seeking, but acts in obedience to an absolute command given by the singleness of his willing. But there must also arise in the subject the recognition of the unconditionally necessary to which his will adheres, or candid trust becomes impossible. As one trusts another that he is inwardly true, he becomes such himself. As one sets up before himself what shall bind him eternally, there arises in him the sense of freedom, in which he realizes himself as wholly in submission.

5. Telic Consciousness; Freedom.

The consciousness of freedom emerging from the elementary ethical transaction is a condition of the life of religion. For reflection upon religion that is experienced reveals that therein one knows himself dependent upon a power from which there is no escape. A human being who finds himself in the movement of history, because by voluntary service to others he is promoted to confidence and therefore to ethical perception, is on the way to religion, if the challenge to unqualified reality embraces also those individual experiences. Only in the complete contemplation of all the real can God be approached. Religion can be a blessed certainty only to one who can uprightly confess that when he found it he confronted naught but reality in all its terrors. Most important of all experiences must be that in which that power by which man is conscious of being wholly vanquished becomes distinct. This becomes possible only where, by voluntary service of others, one arrives at ethical self-determination, or the experience of love. Were there in a man no echo of grateful respect to others, he would be God-forsaken. Only from recollections which awaken in the soul does the irresistible inward-ruling power arise. But this experience vanishes again when much appears in the same person that militates against such confidence. Men themselves afford the means, in the ascent to ethical knowledge, of comparing them with that which reveals their human limitations. Religion becomes real in that moment when the spiritual power already known in experience is abstracted from the individual places of revelation and asserts itself for human consciousness as a self-existent life which answers to pure submission in human experience. How this transpires is unknown, but where it occurs it means, first, the surrender to the power of the good, or morality, and also the revelation of God as the power from which there is no escape and which reveals itself as seeking love. It is the same power that, in individual impulses to confidence, moves man to humility and benevolence, but is now extended as omnipotent goodness over all existence.

6. Religion and God.

To make the power or the certainty of religion more evident one must not only consider its source but also its operation. It was a felicitous step when the Reformers designated faith or obedience to the experienced revelation of God as regeneration. With every closer approximation of the inner life to God, affording a new and deeper grounding of faith in him, the certainty of religious assurance advances. The spiritual power which overcomes man in this act of self-surrender ever carries him beyond the previous limits of his strength. Every moment in which man is inwardly possessed, God is to him the one who rules supremely in all the depths of his being; and yet, at the same time, he is brought to the full realization of his inward autonomy. The inner self-existence of the truly vital is possessed only as one breaks through the confines within which he moved before. That which is retained of the past the blind instinct of self-preservation of

7. Regeneration.

the natural life attempts to assert. Therefore in every vital impulse death is prepared. But to find God means the overcoming of this fate. During every moment experienced in religious progress, whose import is regarded as of divine operation, the old and lifeless is simply discarded so that there is nothing to assert itself against the spiritual power that ever effects new miracles of complete victory and free submission.

The essence of religion is the awakening of man to self-contemplation. The first vital impulse is reverence for the real. A further step is the reflection upon one's utmost experience, the inquiry concerning the might in whose power all are. This proves to be the power which alone overcomes him, gains possession of his inmost self, and approaches in beneficence to humiliate him and sacrifice itself for him. Total realization of religion follows when, in the divine revelation received by experience, this spiritual power abstracts itself from the times and places of its manifestation, and becomes the sum of life. Then religion consists in intercourse with God, which is the immanence of the omnipotence of God and the obedience of a full submission that would conceive his presence and accept his command in every experience. The operation of religion in man is to the effect that the enemies of life are overcome and eternal life is imparted to him. This eternal life means not endless time-space but power to vanquish death, a life whose days are creative and whose inner riches overflow its environment as love and goodness. All vital religion in history requires to resolve itself again and again upon these simple fundamentals of all true religion. Its wholeness involves also the grateful respect for the human and for men through whom it is connected with the creative power of God. A fatal danger in connection with this is the temptation, in regarding the mediators of redemption, to overlook redemption, even God himself. In Christianity this danger is averted if Jesus Christ becomes known to men in his actuality and in the undeniable power of his inner life. For then, and only then, is piety toward him submission to the one God.

8. Summary.

(W HERRMANN.)

II. Special Methods of Study: Even if there be a secret and incommunicable element in religious experience, this does not preclude a legitimate inquiry into the place and nature of religion in human historical life. The departments into which this investigation naturally falls are the history, science, psychology, and philosophy of religion. Religion has embodied itself in customs, institutions, and ideals, and may therefore be studied in its historical conditions. It is, moreover, subject to the same laws of scientific explanation as are other human facts. As a matter of inner personal experience, it is amenable to psychological analysis and description. So far as religion involves a theory of reality—of first cause and final end, of the grounds of knowledge and the validity of the ideal, of man's relation to ultimate Being and to the infinite future—it invites the aid of philosophy and metaphysics. In actual practise these four departments can not be so separated that one is treated irrespective of the others; the divisions which are logical and made for convenience tend continually to fade out or to merge one into the other.

1. Possible Modes of Studying Religion.

The history of religion deals with religious facts as facts. At every point the human race as it emerges in history already practises religion. Of the religious life of prehistoric man many facts are indeed hopelessly lost, but many may still be recovered by the aid of archeology, ethnology, historic peoples in undeveloped condition, and analogy (see COMPARATIVE RELIGION, II.–V.). The aim here is to bring to description every custom, ordinance, myth, doctrine, and institution which rises in or expresses the religious feeling. The particular historian may conceive as his task to present these in concrete images without attempt at analysis or even at correlation (so Herodotus, in his "History"); or his purpose may be to fit these facts into a scheme of religious interpretation (Herbert Spencer, *Principles of Sociology*, London, 1882). As a result of this historical process, three facts stand out; that religion is a social phenomenon, that its object or objects are personal even though in the form of symbols, and that its development is associated with objects so different in form that no one of these can be held to be essential to religion.

2. History of Religion.

The science of religion is concerned with explanation of the facts provided by historical inquiry. Its field is the same as that of the history of religion—beliefs, customs, institutions, and ideals which have been determined by man's relation to the supernatural. It is to be observed, however, that it considers religious phenomena only on their human side; it is in no way concerned with the reality of God and his self-revelation, with the truth of man's relation to God, or with the ground of his hopes. The science of religion treats its material after the manner of other sciences. It makes use of psychology as disclosing the nature of consciousness; of sociology as occupied with social relations; of anthropology as revealing the history of man. It involves judgments in arranging religions as lower and higher, and determining the various stages of religious development and degeneration, together with the aspects that are pathological; and the judgments must be impartial, i.e., not without prejudice but free from unscientific bias. This science of religion aims, through discovering the stages, the direction, and the laws of development, to determine under what conditions religion develops or deteriorates, and finally to ascertain what is essential to it. It is legitimate to seek for the highest type of religion, partly by disclosing the element common in all religions, and partly by tracing this sentiment as it embodies itself in those religions in which it has come to its freest and most natural expression (see COMPARATIVE RELIGION).

3. Science of Religion.

Psychology opens a different pathway into the interpretation of religion. Inquiries here resolve themselves into various directions: the psychological origin of religion, the method and means of its development, the essential unity of the phenomena, the varieties which characterize these, and particular

aspects of religious experience. Psychology traces the religious sentiment to the feeling of dependence and the feeling of mystery or awe.

4. Psychology of Religion.

The feeling of dependence involves ethical causality and teleology. In the feeling of mystery is involved reverence for the indefinitely great or the infinite. The process here is twofold: that of "ejection," by which the self reads into the other (or God) the contents of its own feeling; and that of reading back into one's self both the known qualities of the other (or God) derived from the sense of dependence, and the unknown or mysterious qualities of God which give rise to the feeling of awe or reverence. This investigation of religion is confirmed by a study of the genesis of personal self-consciousness in the child. Religion is thus traced not to an instinct but to an impulse which is incapable of further analysis. In the development of religion, anthropology shows that no one thought-content is essential to religion, that the objects of religious sentiment are symbolic and yet ever personal, and that religion as an experience is a social phenomenon. The unity of religious experience is interpreted from the normal action of consciousness, in which appears the social nature of religion, the personal object of it, and the unfolding of this type of consciousness as a function of personal development wherein religion is seen to be an integral part of normal human consciousness. Its non-appearance in adult life is an indication of arrested development. The varieties of religious experience, whether normal or pathological, are referred to personal idiosyncrasies, due to expansive or repressive emotions, to ideas which arise from different philosophical postulates, and to alterations of personality which set up distinct or separate centers of action within the same individual. Psychology has also its inquiry concerning particular aspects of the religious life as, e.g., with reference to conversion as an adolescent phenomenon or as an adult experience, the nature of religious belief (J. B. Pratt, *The Psychology of Religious Belief*, New York, 1907), mysticism (W James, *Varieties of Religious Experience*, ib. 1907), and the psychology of suggestion and the crowd (Boris Sidis, *The Psychology of Suggestion*, ib. 1909; E. A. Ross, *Social Psychology*, ib. 1908). In this field exploration has scarcely more than blazed the way, but already the work entered upon unconsciously by Augustine in his "Confessions," by Jonathan Edwards (q.v.) with clear purpose in his *Treatise on the Religious Affections*, and by Horace Bushnell (q.v.) in his *Christian Nurture* has produced results of massive and rewarding worth (cf. E. D. Starbuck, *The Psychology of Religion*, London, 1899; G. A. Coe, *The Spiritual Life*, New York, 1900; J. M. Baldwin, *Social and Ethical Interpretations in Mental Development*, ib. 1899; F M. Davenport, *Primitive Traits in Religious Revivals*, ib. 1905; J. M. Baldwin, *Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology*, ii. 458 sqq., ib. 1902; G. B. Cutten, *The Psychological Phenomena of Christianity*, ib. 1908. So far as religion is conceived of as consciousness of social values, it is an attitude, a "construct," built up through overt activities of primitive groups which were either spontaneous and playful or with reference to practical needs of the process of life, for the most part socially mediated. This view finds strong allies in ethnology and functional psychology. The activities and attitudes mutually condition each other, and their difference in different individuals and races is accounted for by reference to the varying social conditions in which they appear and of which they are products (cf. I. King, *The Development of Religion*, ib. 1910; E. S. Ames, *The Psychology of Religious Experience*, Boston, 1910).

The philosophy of religion assumes data drawn from the science of religion and seeks for the ultimate grounds of the beliefs there given, or by an epistemological process endeavors to prove the limitations of human knowledge and so found religion on revelation alone. As a name it has displaced "Natural Theology." It is susceptible of many kinds of treatment. (1) It may involve the problem of our real knowledge of the Absolute as opposed to agnosticism, to pure feeling, to immediate intuition, and to logical demonstration; the problem of the necessity of religion and the essential meaning of revelation; and the problem of the ultimate interpretation of the idea of religion in the identity of God and man as self-conscious Spirit, resulting in a moral idealism wherein is affirmed the unity of all spiritual life—of finite persons among themselves, and of these with the Infinite (cf. J. Caird, *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion*, Edinburgh, 1880). (2) The philosophy of religion may be restricted to theism. Accordingly, its aim is to establish the validity of belief in the supreme reality of the world or God. This is attempted from various points of view in harmony with the particular philosophical assumptions by which different writers are guided. Thus the inquiry is based wholly on revelation as the source of religion (H. Mansel, *Limits of Religious Thought*, London, 1858), upon evolutionary doctrine and personalism (J. Fiske, *Idea of God*, Boston, 1885), intuitional philosophy (S. Harris, *The Philosophical Basis of Theism*, New York, 1887), mystical idealism (C. B. Upton, *Bases of Religious Belief*, London, 1893), ethical considerations (A. Seth, *Two Lectures on Theism*, Edinburgh, 1897), transcendental idealism (J. Royce, *The World and the Individual*, New York, 1900–01; cf. A. Caldecott, *Philosophy of Religion*, ib. 1901). (3) The philosophy of religion may aim at a still wider scope and in so doing traverse most of the questions which arise in systematic theology. Thus it investigates the nature, origin, and development of religion, the nature and relations of man to a higher being, religion as a life both in what it offers and in what it realizes, the reconciliation of the ethical idea of God with the scientific and philosophical doctrine of the world, and the destiny both of things and of persons in their relation to the infinite and absolute self (cf. G. T. Ladd, *Philosophy of Religion*, ib. 1905). (4) The philosophy of religion may endeavor to establish the truth of its axiom of the conservation of value by considerations drawn from epistemology, psychology, and ethics (cf. H. Höffding, *Philosophy of Religion*, London, 1906).

5. Philosophy of Religion.

C. A. Beckwith.

Bibliography: Consult, besides the literature named in the text: C. R. E. von Hartmann, *Das religiöse Bewusstsein der Menschheit*, Berlin, 1882; P. de Broglie, *Problèmes et conclusions de l'histoire des religions*, Paris, 1885; E. Burnouf, *La Science des religions*, Paris, 1885; Eng. transl., *Science of Religions*, London, 1888; H. Derenbourg, *La Science des religions*, Paris, 1885; J. E. Carpenter, *Place of the History of Religion in Theological Study*, London, 1890; Henry R. Marshall, *Instinct and Reason*, New York, 1899; A. J. Balfour, *The Foundations of Belief*, ib. 1901; H. Fielding-Hall, *The Hearts of Men*, ib. 1901; J. Buchan, *The First Things: Studies in the Embryology of Religion*, Edinburgh, 1902; G. Trespioli, *Saggio per uno studio sulla conscienza sociale e giuridica nei codici religiosi*, Parma, 1902; V Staley, *The Natural Religion*, Oxford, 1903; J. A. Picton, *The Religion of the Universe*, London, 1904; R. Eucken, *Der Wahrheitsgehalt der Religion*, Leipsic, 1905; L. R. Farnell, *Evolution of Religion. An Anthropological Study*, London, 1905; J. B. Kinnear, *Foundations of Religion*, ib. 1905; J. L. de Lanessau, *La Morale des religions*, Paris, 1905; J. Martineau, *The Seat of Authority in Religion*, London, 1905; A. Drews, *Die Religion als Selbst-Bewusstsein Gottes. Eine philosophische Untersuchung über das Wesen der Religion*, Jena, 1906; F. B. Jevons, *Religion in Evolution*, London, 1906; O. Pfleiderer, *Religion and Historic Faith*, New York, 1907; E. Grimm, *Theorie der Religion*, Leipsic, 1908; *Religion and the Modern Mind. Lectures delivered before the Glasgow University Society of St. Ninian. By Various Authors*, London, 1908; M. Schinz, *Die Wahrheit der Religion nach den neuesten Vertretern der Religionsphilosophie*, Zurich, 1908; W. Schmidt, *Die Verschiedenen Typen religiöser Erfahrung und die Psychologie*, Gütersloh, 1908; M. Serol, *Le Besoin et le devoir religieux*, Paris, 1908; C. G. Shaw, *The Precinct of Religion in the Culture of Humanity*, London, 1908; J. Watson, *The Philosophical Basis of Religion*, Glasgow, 1908; H. Rashdall, *Philosophy and Religion*, London, 1909; H. E. Sampson, *Progressive Creation. A Reconciliation of Religion with Science*, 2 vols., ib. 1909; E. M. Chapman, *English Literature in Account with Religion, 1800–1900*, Boston, 1910; W. A. Hinckle, *The Evolution of Religion*, Peoria, Ill., 1910; J. H. Leckie, *Authority in Religion*, New York, 1910; H. Vrooman, *Religion Rationalized*, Philadelphia, 1910; B. P. Bowne, *The Essence of Religion*, Boston, 1910.

RELIGION AND LITERATURE.

Common Origin of Religion and Literature (§ 1).
Their Common Appeal to Life (§ 2).
Similarity in Methods (§ 3).
Literature's Indebtedness to Religion (§ 4).
Illustrations; Pope, Goethe (§ 5).
Wordsworth (§ 6).
Browning (§ 7).
Tennyson (§ 8).

Religion and literature spring from the same fundamental sources. Religion is the relation which man bears to ultimate Being. It is concerned with the substance which lies behind phenomena, and also with the duty which man owes to this Being, universal and eternal. It is concerned, too, with the questions what, whence, whither. Literature, in its final analysis, represents the same fundamental relationship: it seeks to explain, to justify, to reconcile, to interpret, and even to comfort and to console. The Homeric poems are pervaded with the religious atmosphere of wonder, of obedience to the eternal, and of the recognition of the interest of the gods in human affairs. A significant place is held by religion in Greek tragedy. A Divine Providence, the eternity, universality, and immutability of law, the inevitableness of penalty, and the assurance of reward represent great forces in the three chief Greek tragedians. Less impressively, yet with significance, the poems of Vergil are bathed in the air of religious mystery and submission. The great work of Lucretius, *De rerum natura*, is, of course, an expression of the human mind in its attempt to penetrate the mysteries of being. The mythology, too, of the non-Christian nations of the north, as well as the literature of the medieval peoples, is concerned with the existence and the work of the gods. In Scandinavian mythology, literature and religion are in no small degree united.

1. Common Origin of Religion and Literature.

Not only do religion and literature spring from the same fundamental sources, they also are formed by the same forces. They both make a constant appeal to life. They assume the presence and orderly use of the reason; they accept the strength of the human emotions of love, fear, curiosity, reverence, —and they both presume and accept the categorical imperative of the conscience and the freedom and force of the will of man. Both gain in dominance, prestige, and usefulness as they are the more intimately related to life. The great themes of religion and literature are similar and are vital: sin, its origin, penalties, and deliverance therefrom; love—the passion, and the will—its place and its limitations; righteousness, and the relation of men to each other. In illustration of the identities of the themes of religion and literature, one may refer to Dante's "Divine Comedy," which is concerned with the passing from and through Hell, where live those who knew not Christ in the earthly life, or, if they knew him, refused to obey, through Purgatory, where dwell those whose sins are not mortal, and into the Paradise where dwell the righteous in an eternity of light and of love. The great poem of the Middle Ages is at once great literature and a certain type of religion. French literature is also pervaded by the religious atmosphere. The religious element in the system of Descartes—both philosophy in literature and literature in philosophy—and of his followers is marked, and from them later French literature drew religion and inspiration. This inspiration, be it said, was both emotional and intellectual. The whole field of modern fiction abounds in examples of the connection between literature and religion; Hawthorne significantly represents the more modern unity in America of the two forces, and among all his works *The Scarlet Letter* and *The Marble Faun* are in this respect most notable. In English fiction George Eliot exemplifies this unity, and of her works *Adam Bede* is an impressive illustration.

2. Their Common Appeal to Life.

Religion and literature, moreover, adopt methods not dissimilar. They stand for the value of the imagination; they represent the artistic, rather than the scientific, methods of interpreting life and phenomena. If theology, which is the science of religion, lends itself to definition and to rational processes largely, religion belongs to the realm of the sentiments and sensibilities—the heart, the conscience, and the will. Literature, too, likewise declines to enter the realm of the formal definition; it is the product of the imagination, and to the imagination it makes its primary appeal, especially in poetry and, to some extent, in noble prose composition. Neither argues or

3. Similarity in Methods.

dogmatizes; both intimate, suggest, and seek to interpret; neither holds definite and precise intellectual judgments regarding things eternal, universal, or divine, but each possesses general beliefs and assurances respecting the divine and the eternal. Neither has a system, a scheme, but each has an intellectual interpretativeness and emotional sympathy with the personal in life and in being.

Religion gives to literature, moreover, vast and rich materials. Its sacred books themselves constitute great literatures and also furnish materials for great literature. The translation of the Bible into Gothic by Ulphilas not only preserved the Bible, but also helped to create and to perpetuate literature. Luther's translation of the Bible and the King James' Version are not only themselves great literatures, but also have helped to form great literatures in modern life. German and English speech, as well as letters, have been made more pure, more intellectual, and more inspiring by these great translations. It may be also added that the sermons of Robert South and of Isaac Barrow (qq.v.) are themselves worthy pieces of literature and might be compared with Burke's *Orations*. It is also to be remembered that the institutions of religion, as the monasteries and cathedral chapter-houses, were, for a thousand years, the custodians of the most precious treasures of literature. The medieval period was dark and damaging to humanity's highest interests. In times of war not only are laws silent, but also literature. It was the monks who preserved the manuscripts of ancient Greece and of Rome, copying and re-copying and commenting from the year 500 till the invention of printing. As the priests were astronomers, not only in Europe, but also in India, in order to fix and to preserve the feast and other holy days, so the monks of the Middle Ages in Europe, if not literary men themselves, were the guardians of the holy lamp of letters.

4. Literature's Indebtedness to Religion.

The religion which has made the strongest appeal to English and German literature in the last two centuries has been of two types: first, the universal or natural, and, second, the distinctively Christian; and the poetry to which the appeal has been chiefly addressed has given back a noble response. In illustration of the universal type, the religion which relates itself to literature, one selects three poets, Pope, Goethe, and Wordsworth. The " Universal Prayer " of Pope, a famous passage in " Faust," and the " Ode to Immortality " are the most representative of all passages of the three. Pope's " Universal Prayer," dedicated to *Deo Optimo Maximo*, declares in its first two verses:

5. Illustrations; Pope, Goethe.

" Thou Great First Cause, least understood!
Who all my sense confined
To know but this, that thou art good,
And that myself am blind;

Yet gave me in this dark estate,
To see the good from ill:
And binding nature fast in fate
Left free the human will."

And closes with the lines:

" To Thee, whose temple is all space,
Whose altar, earth, sea, skies,
One chorus let all being raise;
All nature's incense rise ! "

Between these two sets of verses are found petitions of a distinctive Christian character, as—

" Teach me to feel another's wo,
To hide the fault I see;
That mercy I to others show,
That mercy show to me." *

The same type in essence, although still more general, is found in Faust. In a passage which is supposed, by some, to represent Goethe's own ideas of religion, Faust says:

" The All-enfolding,
The All-upholding,
Folds and upholds he not
Thee, me, Himself?
Arches not there the sky above us?
Lies not beneath us, firm, the earth?
And rise not, on us shining,
Friendly, the everlasting stars?
Look I not, eye to eye, on thee,
And feel'st not, thronging
To head and heart, the force,
Still weaving its eternal secret,
Invisible, visible, round thy life?
Vast as it is, fill with that force thy heart,
And when thou in the feeling wholly blessed art,
Call it, then, what thou wilt,—
Call it Bliss! Heart! Love! God!
I have no name to give it!
Feeling is all in all:
The Name is sound and smoke,
Obscuring Heaven's clear glow." †

With greater eloquence and definiteness, a similar lesson is taught by Wordsworth. The teaching has reference to the immanence of divinity and also to the pr existence of the soul.

6. Wordsworth.

" Our birth is but a sleep and a forgetting:
The Soul that riseth with us, our life's Star,
Hath had elsewhere its setting,
And cometh from afar:
Not in entire forgetfulness,
And not in utter nakedness,
But training clouds of glory do we come
From God, who is our home:
Heaven lies about us in our infancy!
Shades of the prison-house begin to close
Upon the growing Boy,
But He beholds the light, and whence it flows
He sees it in his joy;
The Youth, who daily farther from the east
Must travel, still is Nature's Priest,
And by the vision splendid
Is on his way attended;
At length the Man perceives it die away,
And fade into the light of common day."

" Those first affections,
Those shadowy recollections,
Which, be they what they may,
Are yet the fountain light of all our day,
Are yet a master light of all our seeing;
Uphold us, cherish, and have power to make
Our noisy years seem moments in the being
Of the eternal silence: truths that wake,
To perish never;
Which neither listlessness, nor mad endeavor,
Nor Man nor Boy,
Nor all that is at enmity with joy,

* Pope's *Works*, ii. 463–464.
† Taylor's translation of Goethe's " Faust," vol. i., scene XVI., pp. 221–222.

Can utterly abolish or destroy!
Hence in a season of calm weather
Though inland far we be,
Our souls have sight of that immortal sea
Which brought us hither,
Can in a moment travel thither,
And see the Children sport upon the shore,
And hear the mighty waters rolling evermore." [1]

The teaching of the greatest poets of the last fifty years gives forth lessons even more religious, and also more impressively Christian.

7. Browning. The poems of Browning embody a religion more Christian than is found in either Wordsworth or Pope. That God is a Divine Father, almighty and loving, and that Jesus Christ, his Son, is our Lord, are doctrines which embody both the statement and the atmosphere of Robert Browning. The Pontiff says in "The Pope" in an address made to God:

"O Thou,—as represented here to me
In such conception as my soul allows,—
Under Thy measureless, my atom width!

Our known unknown, our God revealed to man.
Existent somewhere, somehow, as a whole;
Here, as a whole proportioned to our sense,—
There (which is nowhere, speech must babble thus!),
In the absolute immensity, the whole
Appreciable solely by Thyself,—
Here, by the little mind of man, reduced
To littleness that suits his faculty,
In the degree appreciable too." [2]

In other passages Browning speaks of "a need, a trust, a yearning after God." The air is called "the clear, pure breath of God that loveth us." (Crowell's ed., vii. 203.)

The divinity of Christ is also a doctrine taught by Browning. In "Christmas Eve" Christ stands forth as—

"He who trod,
Very man and very God,
This earth in weakness, shame, and pain;" [3]

In the coordinate poem of "Easter" Christ is likewise spoken of as "Thou Love of God." In other passages, too, is found a similar teaching.

"Believe in Me,
Who lived and died, yet essentially
Am Lord of Life." [2]

"The very God! think, Abib; dost thou think?
So, the All-Great, were the All-Loving, too." [3]

"And thou must love Me, who have died for thee." [4]

"Call Christ, then, the illimitable God." [5]

"He, the Truth, is, too, the Word." [6]

"The Great Word which makes all things new." [7]

"The Star which chose to stoop and stay for us."

"That one Face, far from vanish, rather grows,
Or decomposes but to recompose.
Become my universe that feels and knows." [8]

[1] Wordsworth "Ode to Immortality."
[2] *The Ring and the Book*, Crowell's ed. "The Pope," x. 1303–18.
[3] *Christmas Eve*, ib., iv. 286–327. The whole poem is full of the divinity of Christ.
[4] *An Epistle of Karshish*, ib., v. 10–22, 305–307, 311.
[5] *A Death in the Desert*, ib., v. 686.
[6] *The Ring and the Book;* "The Pope," x. 375–376, ib., vii. 175.
[7] *Dramatic Lyrics;* "By the Fireside," xxvii., ib., iv. 131.
[8] *Dramatis Personæ;* "Epilogue, Third Speaker," xii., ib., v. 280.

These quotations might be continued, but they are sufficient to prove the distinctive Christian message of one of the greatest of poets. Tennyson is not so definite in his teaching of

8. Tennyson. Christianity as Browning.[1] But Tennyson's greatest poems contain many passages which embody most direct Christian lessons, expressing as well, with an impressiveness which no other poet has ever attained, the lesson of the soul's immortality. Tennyson is, above all, the apostle of the immortal life. The argument for the life immortal, if an argument it can be called, arises from the infinity and the eternity of love, and also from the fact that even on the evolutionary hypothesis man is made by God. The essence of the creation is personal. God is immanent, not only in man, but in the universe. The union of all men in God creates brotherhood, and this union, also, evolves into righteousness and love. God is immortal love; God is also immortal life, and immortal life and immortal love belong to those who are in God. The evolutionary hypothesis was declared, and had come to be generally accepted in Tennyson's life-time. The last poems indicate his acceptance of evolution. His belief was that evolution would carry man, through God, unto perfection. He declares "Hallelujah to the Maker. It is finished. Man is made." Near his death he wrote, in "God and the Universe," "The face of death is toward the Sun of Life—his truer name is 'Onward.'" [2]

In these illustrations of the relation of religion and literature, no reference has been made to either Shakespeare or Milton. The reason is that in the older and greater poet, almost no mention is made of religion. That Shakespeare was, to a certain degree, impressed by the fundamental truths which constitute religion, there can be no doubt, but also it is clear that his great inspiration he drew from human, and not from divine, relationships. At the opposite extreme stands John Milton, who was far more a theologian than a religious poet. If Shakespeare represents the inspiration arising from human relationships, John Milton represents inspiration drawn from those dogmatic formulas which represent the skeleton, but not the life, of the Christian system.

It is apparently singular that the larger share of the illustrations used to present the relations existing between religion and literature are drawn from poetry. The singularity is, however, only superficial. For poetry is the highest and richest form and expression of literature; it represents the highest notes of the scale of thought, feeling, and imagination. Religion is the highest type of being, for it represents the relation of man to God and of God to man. Each, therefore, rises the highest in its own scale of being; each, therefore, becomes more clearly and closely akin to the other than are the other higher forces of humanity. They are related to each other far more intimately and constantly than can any type of prose literature be related to religion, either Christian or natural.

CHARLES F THWING.

[1] E. Berdoe, *Browning and the Christian Faith*, pp. 42, 43, 45 (London, 1896).
[2] S. A. Brooke, *Tennyson: his Art and Relation to Modern Life*, p. 30 (New York, 1894).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: W. S. Tyler, *Theology of the Greek Poets*, Andover, 1867; S. A. Brooke, *Theology in the English Poets, Cowper, Coleridge, Wordsworth, and Burns*, New York, 1875, new ed., 1910; idem, *Development of Theology . . . in English Poetry, 1780–1830*, ib. 1893; idem, *Religion in Literature and Religion in Life*, ib. 1901; G. McCrie, *Religion of Our Literature*, London, 1875; J. C. Shairp, *Culture and Religion*, Edinburgh, 1878; C. J. Abbey, *Religious Thought in Old English Verse*, London and New York, 1892; T. W. Hunt, *Ethical Teachings in Old English Literature*, New York, 1892; L. Campbell, *Religion in Greek Literature*, London and New York, 1898; S. L. Wilson, *Theology of Modern Literature*, New York, 1899; W. S. Lilly, *Studies in Religion and Literature*, St. Louis, 1905; C. G. Shaw, *Precinct of Religion in the Culture of Humanity*, New York, 1908; E. G. Sihler, *Testimonium animæ*, New York, 1908; K. S. Guthrie, *Spiritual Message of Literature*, Chicago, 1909; E. M. Chapman, *English Literature and Religion, 1800–1900*, London, 1910.

RELIGION, PHILOSOPHY OF.

I. History.
1. Ancient.
Early Greeks (§ 1).
Plato and Aristotle (§ 2).
Neoplatonism (§3).
Stoicism (§ 4).
Eclecticism (§ 5).
The Church Fathers (§ 6).
2. Medieval.
Anselm and Successors (§ 1).
3. Modern.
Descartes; Spinoza (§ 1).
Leibnitz (§ 2).
The Enlightenment; English and French Deists (§ 3).
Kant and Criticism (§ 4).
Fichte; Schelling (§ 5).
Schleiermacher (§ 6).
Hegel (§ 7).
Post-Hegelian (§ 8).
Herbart and Lotze (§ 9).
Von Hartmann; Ritschl (§ 10).
Contemporary Thought (§ 11).
II. Analysis of Religion.
Method (§ 1).
Representation (§ 2).
Feeling (§ 3).
Will (§ 4).
Generalization (§ 5).
Relative Estimation (§ 6).

The philosophy of religion is that aspect of philosophy which employs itself with the fact of religion in view of its intellectual formulation. The conception of the philosophy of religion differs not only according as religion is defined, but also as the relation of philosophy to it is formulated. Religion may constitute the content of philosophy, so that the latter may absorb the former and become itself religious. Philosophy may easily become theosophy, or may even approximate mysticism, while satisfying all religious requirements. To such an extreme a religious philosophy would be superfluous. Again, as soon as a system of thought deals with the idea of God, and regards this as essential to its completion, or perhaps to the understanding of the entire world of experience, a religious philosophical side can not be denied to the same. Religion would always be touched upon, although such a thought-system would be unsatisfactory to a deeply susceptible religious disposition. If in these two related varieties a philosophical explanation is to be secured, this does not obtain for the later view of the philosophy of religion, the object of which is to recognize and explain religious phenomena or religion in general, both subjective and objective, by means of thought. This must take place on the basis of psychological investigation and the collection and use of historical materials. The first is to determine religion as such; the second is to present the evolution of religion and at least throw some light on its primal forms. This differs from the old view according to which religion was more or less philosophy, and the philosopher was assumed to be religious himself; or he at least professed the truth of the views about God and divine things set forth by him. Here the object of investigation is religion itself, and the investigator is not necessarily an adherent of such religion, or even religiously minded. An approximation to the first would occur where the investigator would preclude the impartiality of the result by bringing his own convictions into the test. The two forms are occasionally combined and first demand a historical review.

I. History.—1. Ancient: Strictly considered every philosophical system of the universe involves a religious tincture, even if no religious feelings are brought to light. Here only those are to be selected in which a philosophy of religion comes into prominence, and of such only the principal ones. The statement of Xenophanes that the heaven or the world was God, appears as a religious affirmation, especially when compared with his vigorous attacks on anthropomorphism. Anaxagoras in his distinction between matter and spirit, in which he assigned the construction of order from chaos to the latter, did not call spirit by the name of the deity; yet he introduced the principle of dualism and furnished the basis for the development of the later deism. Socrates was a man of pious mind as shown in his teaching of the " dæmon " and in his conviction that the distinction between the rightness and wrongness of certain actions was to be referred directly to the deity, with which he believed himself to be in connection. For theology and the philosophy of religion he struck the keynote for the future in founding teleology as a world theory and relating all things in the interest of human welfare to the ordaining benevolence of the first cause from whose reason the human understanding is descended.

1. Early Greeks.

Plato's view of the world was not only ethical but religious. God is conceived as the absolute good; the phenomenal world is the sphere of evil and wickedness. The object of man is to flee to the world of ideas and so become like God, although this world is a copy of the higher one and can not be therefore contemned. The kinship of the soul to ideas, that is, the supramundane, constitutes its immortality. A considerably developed philosophy of religion appears in the metaphysics of Aristotle (q.v.) though the inner religious element as found in Plato is retired; yet Aristotle's system exerted a deep and manifold influence upon the philosophy of religion. He excludes from his ethics the inquiry of Plato into the metaphysical good or idea as the impulse of acquiring and practising good qualities. In his " First Philosophy," which he named also *theologike*, he presents his idea of God more definitely and clearly in strict deduction from his metaphysical principles. He distinguishes between the possi-

2. Plato and Aristotle.

ble or potential and the actual. Every change into actuality requires an actual as agent. God must be the first agent, and must be pure energy, which is absolute form or immaterial spirit, and therefore unchangeable and one. As Spirit he thinks and the object of his thought is himself, and this is his activity, in which he enjoys the supreme felicity. In relation with the world he moves all, but neither creates nor transacts, he is the good or end toward which all things strive, just as one beloved, though unmoved and at rest, always exercises an influence upon the lover. The world, uncreated, always existed and will never cease to be; and, ever gaining in form and losing in matter, it strives after perfection, toward a similarity with God, the highest form of all. The idea of deification as it occurs in the later mystics indeed did not materialize in Aristotle, but the efficacious forms in nature may be taken as the representative content of God. God is in the world with his ideas, and while elsewhere Aristotle holds firmly to the transcendence of God, here there appears an immanence. It would follow, that, alongside of an expressed theism, there exists a pantheism. Aristotle sought to illustrate the relation by that of a general who is outside of the army yet prevails within with his authoritative plans. He became the esteemed authority for scholasticism, by his doctrine of God as well as by his logic, physics, and ethics.

3. Neoplatonism.

Neoplatonism (q.v.), starting from the idealistic tendencies of these two prototypes, far exceeded them in subtle speculation and emphasis upon the religious. Not stopping at knowledge or mental activity as the highest aim of man with Aristotle, it pursued the example of Philo (q.v.) in the supreme union with the highest principle by means of ecstatic transport, indeed, only transiently, since the corporate soul can not wholly release itself from the earthly. In this unity which ultimately becomes continuous and eternal, man becomes deified, and a duality of the seeing and seen ceases in a complete unity called by Photinus, *aplosis*. Where the limit of intelligible thought is thus transgressed, it is doubtful if philosophy of religion can cover the ground. Certainly such doctrine issues not from speculation but inner experience; and those offshoots of superstition, such as the theurgy and magic of Jamblicus, must be excluded. But the theodicy is the most developed of all antiquity, and the prototype of that of the present. In Plotinus' argument for the divine justification, the individual must be viewed in the harmonious unity of the whole, and the worst fits into the harmony to set off the excellence of the good. He shrinks from defining the deity or unity, following Philo and the eclectic Platonists in regarding it as transcending all thought and being, of which there was to be predicated merely that it forbade all difference, multiplicity, or similarity. Here Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite (see Dionysius), Scotus Erigena (q.v.), and other German mystics fixed their points of contact. The last of this school, Proclus, presents the world development from unity.

Stoicism (q.v.) was preeminently entitled to the name of religious philosophy. Although it was materialistic, both in principle and results, and pantheistic, yet it not only presented the deity theoretically, but was richly tinged with religion, a fact which serves to account for its widespread popularity in the Roman world. The most distinguished save one of this school, the poet Cleanthes, proves his piety in his hymn to Zeus by praising the omnipresent, eternal reason of deity, which rules all and restores what human folly has subverted. The last representatives of the Stoic school, Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius (qq.v.), display deep piety in connection with their philosophic thoughts. On the physical side, the Stoics follow the Heraclitean principle that the primal matter was fire. The active power in the whole cosmic process is deity, giving all things form and support, permeating the world as a warm breath, as reason ordering all things, and containing within itself the separate rational germ forms from which individual appearances develop. The beauty and adaptability of the whole world and its parts point to the existence of a thinking, foreseeing, creating Spirit. The universe or God is to be regarded as having a consciousness, and from this follows the conclusion that the world has conscious parts; and as the whole is more complete than any part, it must have consciousness in a real measure. If deity is absolute reason it must reign everywhere, and all that is must be logical or rational. Thus on the physical basis there was optimism; on the ethical otherwise. Chrysippos compared men to maniacs. Human life was full of errors and moral faults, and it was the most woful of all dramas. Like the later Neoplatonists, whom they anticipated in some essential elements, the Stoics had to develop a theodicy, in order to save their logical deistic principle. However, to win ordinary acceptance for their doctrine, they were wont to make application to the individual and carry it to the absurd. Moral evil, on the other hand, was a burden, imposed upon guilty man. The Stoics were fond of the antithesis that on the physical side ruled the law of necessity by the inevitable connection of cause and effect; on the ethical side, if it was a question of will and act, man should be capable of free choice. The efforts to demonstrate the transition from the possession of the Logos to the bad as well as the relation of necessity and freedom were unsuccessful. An interesting side to Stoicism is its explanation of myths, in which it is the successor of Cynicism. Anxious to make a connection with the popular mind and unable to adopt polytheism and its myths, it resorted to the allegorical method. Myths were explained as allegories of natural or moral life, and the gods as personifications of powers. This method was taken over by Jewish writers, particularly Philo, and became popular in patristic Christian Scripture interpretation. As the supernatural or supramundane did not come within the horizon of the Stoics, their physical theory was theocentric in the nature of their hylozoic heritage, and their ethics was in close adjustment with nature as a whole, as shown by their sharp ethical interest in necessity and freedom. To live in harmony with nature and reason was not infrequently a religious enthusiasm. Religious philosophy touches upon Epicureanism (q.v.) so far as this undertook to ex-

4. Stoicism.

plain religious ideas by ignorance and fear and looked upon them as causes of the worst evils.

Though Stoicism permeated Christian thought with its influence, it was not transplanted like Neoplatonic idealism or mysticism. Pseudo-Dionysius in coupling Neoplatonism with Christianity took much from Proclus. In his "negative theology" God the nameless transcends both positive and negative predicates. In his "affirmative theology" God the all-named embraces all realities. In addition a symbolic theology takes its nomenclature from the world of sense. Essential is the abstraction from all positive and negative attributes as God, a sort of mystical negation of knowledge combined with a transport to God and a "theosis," or deification, the final ideal of the Neoplatonists as well as of the Church Fathers, such as Clement, Origen, Hippolytus, and Athanasius. Closely following him in identifying true philosophy with religion and in the distinction of negative and positive theology was Scotus Erigena (q.v.). The procession of individual things from deity, which he conceives somewhat like the emanation theory of the Neoplatonists, he calls unfolding; the reunion of multiplicity in God is effected by the Logos. Pure pantheism, represented by Amalric of Bena and David of Dinant (qq.v.), was doubtless related from Scotus and with him branded as heretical, but mystics like Bernard and Hugo and Richard of St. Victor (qq.v.) were tolerated, although they indulged transport and absolute submission to God as the highest aim not to be attained by human will and power, but by divine grace. Not speculation, but practical mysticism in the fullest form appears with Meister Eckhart (q.v.) and his followers, who were professed pantheists. The souls fall into ecstatic transport while the body is as dead; and upon their return, no expression of what transpired is possible in words. It claims to have been where it was before its creation, where God is and he alone.

5. Eclecticism.

The Christian Gnostics (see GNOSTICISM) may be said to have made the first attempt at a Christian philosophy of religion. Their system consisted not so much of speculative conceptions as of the presentation of a fantastic world, or Christian mythology, which was not to be acknowledged by the Church. Aloof from this kept Justin Martyr (q.v.) who, the first of the apologists, regarded himself a Christian and philosopher, and assumed all the true and rational to be Christian also. Hellenic in speculation, he presents God as nameless and indescribable, yet one, eternal, unbegotten, and unmoved. He reigns over the heavens and first begat the Logos by whom he created the world. Less pronounced as Christian were Athanagoras and Minucius Felix. The former argues for monotheism on rational grounds. The gods are supposed to be localized, but this is impossible as God, who created the world, was in the space outside the world, where no other God could be; and, if localized there, could not concern those in the world; and he would, as circumscribed in his presence and operation, be no true God. The latter deduces the knowledge of God, though incomplete, from the order of nature and organic adaptability, and monotheism from the unity of nature. The earliest originality of thought appears with the Alexandrine school, which entered a closer inquiry into the relation of believing and knowing; and employed philosophy to lift the former to the latter. According to Clement (q.v.) no positive knowledge of God is possible; knowable is the Logos, the mediator between God and the world, wherefore the order of the world is rational. Indebted to Philo, yet he exceeds him and the subsequent Neoplatonists in teaching that the real gnostic becomes not only like God but is incarnate god himself; and that he swathes divinity not only in special ecstatic hours but enjoys eternal rest in God. With Origen (q.v.) the conception of "restitution" takes the place of *theosis;* after being cleansed from sin, men are restored to the original state of happiness and goodness. His "First Principles" is an attempt to systematize Christian dogma, and presents much for the philosophy of religion; especially, in the beginning, where God is declared to be the eternal ground of all existence, and much that is Neoplatonic appears. Dependent on him are the Greek Fathers of whom Gregory of Nyssa (q.v.) was the speculative representative and the precursor of medieval scholasticism by explaining that the name God stands for the essence of deity and not the persons (hypostases), so that the three divine persons constitute one deity. His superior speculative gifts are evidenced also in the attempt to prove the church doctrines by reason, in which the Scripture was included. Augustine (q.v.) was as much philosopher as theologian, so that he may well-nigh rank as a Neoplatonist; but above speculation rises his strong religious feeling. The ground of all knowledge is in the consciousness of man's spiritual processes. The only eternal truth is God, who embraces all true being and is the supreme good. The Aristotelian categories can not be applied to him. He is "good without quality, great without quantity, a creator without want, reigning without position, upholding all things without condition, everywhere whole without place, eternal without time" (*De trinitate,* v. 2; Eng. transl., *NPNF,* 1st ser., iii. 88). He is the supreme essence, has given being, though not the highest, to things created in graded series, and upholds the world by incessant re-creation, without which it would sink into primal nothing. Here beside transcendence is immanence. The "City of God," which presents historical development from the religious point of view, at the conclusion carries the temporal over into the eternal, and marks a distinction for all time between the eternally blessed and the eternally damned.

6. The Church Fathers.

2. Medieval: Augustine's influence upon scholasticism was considerable, especially by the Platonic and Neoplatonic elements. The axiom of Anselm of Canterbury (q.v.), "I believe that I may understand," was taken from him, and from the Alexandrines preceding. Reason is above faith like a superstructure above the foundation; not to dispute its right and content, but, assuming at the outset what is to be proved, to set it forth in a clearer light. Beside the cosmological argument that the

1. Anselm and Successors.

ascending series of the created things must presuppose a final self-existent being as first cause, Anselm definitely formulated the ontological argument, that the highest which is God must be not only in thought but in reality as well, otherwise a higher could be thinkable. In the history of the argument for the existence of God, Anselm's position is one of the most eminent; for it must be acknowledged that the being of God, as securely established for the religious consciousness, can never be omitted from the definition. His doctrine of the Trinity, that the speaker and the spoken word are two and yet one so that there occurs a "reflex," is somewhat artificial. In his atonement theory he conceives the guilt of mankind, because committed against the infinite God, to be infinitely great, to be atoned for by an infinite punishment or its equivalent. The whole human race, unable to give satisfaction would fail under total condemnation; hence, satisfaction could be only vicariously rendered, and by God himself, that is, by the second person of the Trinity, who must needs become incarnate. The death of Christ is a positive act, satisfying God's justice by virtue of his goodness, not by a penalty. Anselm had advanced so far in his rational proofs of even specific doctrines that the leading scholastic successors had to retrench. Albertus Magnus (q.v.) gave up the proof of the Trinity and introduced a distinction sharpened by his pupil Thomas Aquinas (q.v.), between such propositions as, given by revelation, were above, though not contrary to, reason; and such as were established by reason alone, the Trinity being among the former. In the proof of the unity of God, he rests on the monotheism of Aristotle, who is his philosophic basis throughout. Anselm's argument for the existence of God is, for him, not binding. Although it is a matter of faith, yet Aquinas offers a series of proofs partly Aristotelian. On the other hand, even before Anselm, there were among scholastics partizans of the reason. Berengar of Tours (q.v.) stated that contrary to truth is equivalent to contrary to reason, a sentence that could be readily inverted. Abelard (q.v.) went so far as to invert the axiom of Anselm into, "I understand that I may believe," to rationalize Christian verities, and to designate the persons of the Trinity as power, wisdom, and goodness. Raymond Lully (q.v.) declared that all Christian dogmas could be proved; while the nominalist William of Occam (q.v.) affirmed that whatever is beyond experience must be resigned to faith, and that the existence of God could not be shown either by experience or on rational grounds. Thus, the relation between believing and knowing, revelation and reason, philosophy and theology, occupied the place of prominence from Clement throughout the Middle Ages. The same problem continued in the Renaissance, in which an independent philosophy of religion was reawakened, in more or less indebtedness to antiquity. Without mentioning further the schools hitherto treated, which continued in their philosophical significance, among those contributing peculiar aspects of thought appears Nicholas of Cusa (q.v.), who was indebted to Neoplatonism, Meister Eckhart (q.v.), and, particularly, to scholasticism. Denying with the nominalists that Christian dogmas are to be demonstrated by reason, he teaches that God is the absolute maximum and absolute minimum, present in all things, resolving in himself irreconcilables, unknowable in his essence, cognized by the negative of knowing (*docta ignorantia*), and immediately to be perceived, yea by ecstasy to be reached. The world of phenomena is the unfolding of what is contained in God, and each individual thing represents the infinity of God. The search for the truth constitutes religion, which is knowledge apprehending God, and its end is blessedness. On the whole he shows himself a pantheist and mystic in what is characteristic of his views, and his advance step is his inclination to the exact sciences; particularly, the infinity of space and time in the universe, taken up by his pupil Giordano Bruno (q.v.). To Bruno the universe is deity, and he scarcely distinguishes between God and nature. The three ideal principles of form, moving cause, and object he makes one in the organism with matter. Tomaso Campanella (q.v.) sought to prove that all religions were originally one and the same, namely, purely natural, and that all things strive for self-preservation, which is to return to their real principle, which is the deity. The four varieties of this process are the four kinds of religion: natural, animal, rational, and supernatural. Beside reason supplemented by revelation there is an "inner touch," united with the love of God. For God's existence, he adds to innate and supernatural knowledge another proof. Man as a finite being can not originate the representation of the infinite being which he possesses; therefore, the infinite which causes it necessarily exists.

3. Modern: The same argument was reproduced by Descartes (q.v.), who thought to prove the existence of God beyond a mathematical certainty. The above he develops into a particular cosmological argument: man, inasmuch as he possesses a realization of God, would not exist if God did not exist. Had he created himself he would have given himself all possible perfections; but sprung from his ancestry, there must be for the series of descent a first cause. The ontological argument is stated differently from Anselm. All perfections are to be predicated of the being or idea of God; existence is a perfection; therefore, God necessarily exists. God is the eternal, unchangeable, omniscient, omnipotent, self-existent substance, and this created the extended thinking substances. Matter is inert and all changes take place by cause and effect. God's control of nature is the mechanical; the sum of matter and movement is constant. Though he was lacking in religious inwardness, yet a concern for religion in putting up these arguments for the existence of God can not be denied to Descartes. Spinoza (q.v.) in his *Tractatus theologico-politicus* endeavors to point out the essential difference between religion and philosophy. Each has its own peculiar object; reason dealing with truth and wisdom, theology with piety and obedience. It is not necessary to reconcile them, and not possible, since the Bible deals with moral laws only. In the philosophy of the identity of spirit and matter he is wholly a pantheist (deity being equivalent to sub-

1. Descartes; Spinoza.

stance or that which is) and a naturalist. He may be regarded as a strong religious personality, if absorption in the universal, in love for the universal or God, which rests upon intuition, may be called religion; but irreligious if the counter-relation of God and man be included. The personality of God is excluded since even will and reason are denied to him; and there can be no designing providence, since the process of becoming follows after mechanical, mathematical laws. All things proceed from the nature of God by inevitable necessity, and his power and being are identical. The good is a conception of the human imagination, which obtains for man only; and there is no absolute good. God is both spirit and body. The essence of spirit is thought which issues in the intuition of God, bringing perfection, freedom, salvation from suffering, and joy, which is love, to its object.

2. Leibnitz.

In place of the dead mechanism of Spinoza, Leibnitz offers his postulate of a development from within, toward distinct ends, by a scale of monads instinct with life and power. With this he attempts to combine the mechanism. On the antithesis of faith and reason, he maintained that some acceptable truths of revelation are incapable of rational proof; but they are valid, if only they be not contrary to reason. The latter he limits to what is contrary to the eternal and absolutely necessary truths; and thus he makes room to accept the church doctrines as possible, including that of the Trinity. God is the final absolute monad, the primal unity and highest good, yet present to all the individual monads. He necessarily exists, as the cause common to all the finite monads; otherwise the mutual adaptability between the monads and between body and soul would not be possible, whereas the universal harmony among them must be a preestablished one. The first cause has so organized each monad that it reflects the whole more or less perfectly. The ontological argument he deemed valid only if the idea of the perfect being be shown to be possible, which he regarded to mean as including no limits or negation. The cosmological argument he construes so that, starting out with the contingency of finite things, a necessary absolute first cause must be presupposed. Inasmuch as every monad is a reduced reflex of the highest, God's attributes may be deduced by exaggerating those of the soul to the utmost. The world composed of distinct monads rising in their scale according to the clearness of representation must be the best possible world; for, if not, God either would not or could not create a better. The first is contradicted by his goodness; the second by his omnipotence. In his theodicy he recognizes metaphysical, physical, and moral evil which he explains as a negative condition of the imperfection of the finite monads. In addition, without evil there would be no good; moreover, it multiplies the good, like Adam's sin, the occasion for Christ's redemption. On the ground that the being of all monads is representation, religion is based on the representation of the highest monad, that is, God. This knowledge of the perfect toward which the human monad strives originates love for it. Human souls have a sense of kinship to God, whose attitude toward them is not as to creatures but like that of sovereign to subject or father to children. Here is the point of departure for the antithesis of the kingdom of nature and the kingdom of grace. Inasmuch as love to God is dependent on correct representation or cognition, intellectualism is implanted upon the domain of religion. Ascending degrees of illumination bear with them corresponding degrees of religion, morality, and happiness. The path is open to the Enlightenment of the eighteenth century.

3. The Enlightenment; English and French Deists.

Christian Wolff (q.v.), chief representative of this period, sets himself the task of providing a clear, distinct knowledge, without which the aim of mankind or happiness can not be reached. In his *Theologia naturalis* he treats extensively the proofs of God's existence and attributes. He prefers the a posteriori argument that the contingency of the world presupposes necessarily a first cause, without which it is not intelligible. But to be considered an adequate ground for the world, reason and free will must be ascribed to him, and he must be infinite Spirit. To this, the a priori concept of his predecessors is added. Revealed theology is not disputed, and revelations transcending reason are not contrary to reason. As God is omnipotent, he can afford immediate revelation by miracle. H. S. Reimarus (q.v.) is to be classed as a deist so far as he denied all divine miracle save that of the original creation. Any miracles in addition would negate the wisdom and perfection of the Creator, since they would imply later interference as necessary. Most distinguished in the rationalistic Enlightenment was Lessing (q.v.), who conceded to historical revelation a temporary significance to be superseded as soon as reason had deduced its truths from its own ground. The early English philosophers show a minor appreciation for the religious. Francis Bacon (q.v.) entertained the idea of parallels; religion and science can not be merged. The result of mixing science with religion is unbelief; vice versa, fantasy. Thomas Hobbes (q.v.) finds the motive of religion as well as of superstition to be fear of the unseen powers. It is the former when acknowledged by the State, otherwise the latter. To oppose personal conviction to the faith enjoined by the sovereign is tantamount to revolution. Herbert of Cherbury (see Deism, I., § 1) asserts the independence of reason in the domain of religion, finding the " marks in common," and obtaining five natural truths of religion, to which belong the existence of God, duty, and retribution. It is customary to regard him as the first deist. His view that the idea of God is innate is denied by Locke in his empiricism. The existence of a Supreme Being is more certain, however, to him than the reality of the external world, but by way of reflection, supported by the cosmological argument. Divine revelation is not denied, but must not contradict reason. John Toland (q.v.), the first to be designated " free thinker," claimed that Christianity did not necessarily contain anything mysterious and that the Christian doctrines presented nothing above or contrary to reason. A chief work of English deism was William

Tyndall's (q.v.) *Christianity as Old as the Creation*, in which it is taught that natural religion was perfect from the beginning, and was restored by Christ. Radical opposition to rational dogmatism in religion, as well as against deism and natural religion, appears with David Hume (q.v.) in his skeptical theory of knowledge. Religious principles can not be proved by reason, but must be accepted by faith. In his *Natural History of Religion* (1755) he laid the permanent foundation for a philosophy of religion, the purpose of which is psychological analysis and the investigation of historical development. This method did not present monotheism but polytheism as the primitive form. The roots of religion were passive, fear and hope, not the perception of nature and reflective thought. Pressed by natural necessities, and anxious and restive before the uncertain accidents of life and impending evil, particularly death, men asked what the future would bring, and encountered with surprise traces of deity. To refer all to one being was not possible among the varying circumstances; and the tendency of comparison with self led to the anthropomorphic conception. Monotheism came not by reflection and the perception of a universe conformable to law, but from practical reasons beginning with the idea of God as Creator and Ruler. Oscillations between monotheism and polytheism occur later, even in Christianity. As regards tolerance, monotheism is behind the other, which by nature may admit contemporary forms. The principles of English deism were transferred to French soil by Voltaire (q.v.), whose famous sentence was: "If God did not exist he would have to be invented, but all nature acclaims that he is." He attacked Christianity violently as based on illusion, and spreading fanaticism and superstition. [In justice to Voltaire it should be borne in mind that his antagonism was not to religion itself, but to degenerate religion as exemplified by the extremely corrupt forms and practises current in the France of his day.] Baron d'Holbach (q.v.), on the other hand, in his *Système de la nature* (1770) taught radical atheism, claiming that the divine potencies were products of a deceived imagination, prompted by fear and ignorance, and that the idea of God was unnecessary and injurious, the cause of unrest instead of comfort.

Kant (q.v.) revolutionized the status of religion in shifting the basis to morality, though he belongs to the Enlightenment. In his earlier *Allgemeine Naturgeschichte und Theorie des Himmels* (1755) he

4. Kant and Criticism.

postulates a first cause upon the purposive operations of the powers of nature. In his *Der einzig mögliche Beweisgrund zu einer Demonstration des Daseins Gottes* (1763), a skepticism about proofs for the existence already appears. He states that Providence did not leave the views necessary to happiness dependent upon subtle deductions, but to the immediate perceptions of natural common sense. Yet he reasons a priori that it is impossible that nothing exists; for that would mean that all that is requisite for the possible was made void; but that whereby all possibility is removed is itself impossible. In the statement at this place, that it is necessary that one convince himself of the existence of God but not necessary that he demonstrate it, he anticipates the foremost conclusion of his critical work; that, where knowing ends faith begins, which has a sure foundation on the moral. Significant is it that intellectualism for religion was here dethroned. In the "Critique of Pure Reason" the proofs for the existence of God are subjected to severe criticism. The ontological argument is void because existence can not belong to the real predicates of the most perfect being along with the others, but is rather a judgment of the object together with all its predicates. The cosmological and physico-theological arguments require the ontological for their completion, and are therefore not conclusive. Even if the cosmological were conclusive, it would yet fall short of proving the perfectness of the final cause, which the idea of God calls for; and if the teleological argument would show a supermundane being, such would not be an omnipotent Creator but the cosmic architect, in view of universally manifest design. Proceeding to positive theology in the search for the certainty of the existence of God, Kant does not dismiss rational belief from philosophy, as was formerly done in the absolute separation of knowledge and faith, but he does not admit it as knowledge. The existence of God obtains as a practical postulate alongside of freedom and immortality. The combination of virtue and happiness is an a priori-synthetic judgment and thus necessary, but does not become actual on account of the non-agreement of the natural and moral laws. Hence a supernatural being is postulated holy and just, who effects this reconciliation by reason and will. This is known as the moral argument, the central point in the moral theology in the "Critique of the Practical Reason." Again, belief in God's existence is based on the conscience, as the consciousness of the inner court in man, which appears in dual personality of accuser and judge. The accuser must conceive himself under another being, almighty but moral, God. The fact remains undetermined whether this is a real or an ideal person invented by reason. The keyword of Kant's ethics is duty, the categorical imperative in man, whereby he legislates for his own choice and conduct. All duties are divine commands; wherefore God and the legislator in man would coincide. This might point to a form of pantheism, which Kant, however, could never have confessed. The moral ground or moral consciousness of "religion within the limits of reason alone" is emphasized by the omission of other motives of religion; he would mark the limits against whatever of revealed religion is not rationally apprehended. All religious practise or conduct which issues not from ethical law is sham. The moral order is inverted by the ceremonial element in religion, which is fetish worship. Such also is prayer considered as an inner formal act of service, as a means of grace. The spirit of prayer is the consciousness with every act, of doing it in the service of God. In the "Critique of Judgment," with reference to the existence of God, all things are to be explained, of course, by mechanical laws, but this does not exclude the reflection, with reference to forms of nature or even to nature as a whole, upon the fundamental princi-

ple of their objective causes. Not to be able to escape the idea of purpose argues for the dependence of the world upon, and origin from, a being existing beyond the world, and this is rational because of design. God's existence, however, is not proven but here merely rests upon reflection upon design in nature.

5. Fichte; Schelling.

J. G. Fichte (q.v.) in his *Versuch einer Kritik aller Offenbarung* (1792) at first adopted Kant's moral view of rational faith; but, in addition, assumed that, where there is a state of moral depravity, miracle and revelation may serve as stimulants to morality. Later in his treatment of the ground of faith in a divine government of the world, which gave rise to the atheistic controversy, he made religion to be faith in the moral order, which in its energy and operation is God. To assume beyond this that God is a special substance is impossible and contradictory, and his opponents are the real atheists who have no God, inasmuch as they set up an idol which debases the reason and multiplies and perpetuates human misery. The positive religions are institutions which morally preeminent men have set up to effect in others the development of the moral sense. They employ symbols to present abstract thoughts to sense and propagate religion in wider circles; but the essential element is that of something supersensible not contained in nature, and the end of the development is the rational ethical faith. Soon after, however, Fichte passed from subjective idealism or the absolute Ego over to the absolute as the middle ground of philosophy. God is absolute being, in whose absolute thought nature is opposed as the unreal non-ego. Religion is no longer mere morality, a mystical strain is added. The world of changeable phenomena is merely unsatisfying appearance, a mirage. To think oneself and all the universe in terms of unchangeable being is faith. True life is in God, the really unchangeable being, and this is the love of God. Philosophy and religion are identified. Finite being has a share in deity, varying according to degrees of consciousness. Religion is merely assertory; philosophy explains the how. Hence there must underlie a cosmic theory, so that metaphysics is the immediate element of religion, even religion itself. Schelling (q.v.), far from being religious, regarded matter or nature itself as the divine, in his natural philosophy (1797–99). But in his philosophy of identity (1800–1802), the absolute, which is the identity of subject and object, and is the condition of the existence of every individual thing, is to him as God. Philosophy and religion consist in the intellectual perception of the infinite or absolute in the finite. Paganism consists in degrading the infinite to the finite; Christianity reverses the process. He approximates a mysticism of the kind of Jakob Boehme (q.v.) in his *Untersuchungen über das Wesen der menschlichen Freiheit* (1809) and in his reply to F H. Jacobi against the charge of atheism and naturalism he states that God is to him first and last; the former as impersonal indifference or the absolute; the latter as personality, the subject of existence. The usual theism was impotent and empty; the mystical and irrational are the real speculative. In his "Positive Philosophy," which is religious, philosophical, and mystical, he would not show from the concept of God his existence, but from existence would demonstrate the divinity of that which exists. If a positive exists as transcendent, it is to be taken up with the historical religions. But religion is either mythology or revelation, i.e., incomplete or complete. Therefore positive philosophy is essentially philosophy of mythology and revelation. Though furnishing no united system, Schelling stimulated much activity in the field of philosophy of religion. Of his followers, the fantastic K. A. Eschenmayer attempted to convert philosophy into its negative, or religious faith; and K. C. F. Krause, who called his doctrine panentheism, sets forth fundamentally God or being as the one good, and the perception and inner appropriation of the same as religion, or the participation in the one life of God.

6. Schleiermacher.

From the ethicized types of religious philosophy of Kant and Fichte, Schleiermacher (q.v.), in his *Reden* (1799), made a signal departure, and from the rationalistic as well, not without a certain degree of shallowing. The same views are essentially reproduced in his *Dialektik* (1811) and *Der christliche Glaube* (1821). He finds in man as the basis of religion a particular faculty, the pious sense or feeling, for the thought of which he was indebted to Romanticism (q. v.). By means of it there is an immediate intuition or feeling of the infinite and eternal amid the finite. To feel everything as a part of the whole and to become one with the eternal is religion. Piety or subjective religion is neither a matter of cognition nor action, but a determination of feeling or self-consciousness. When it is stated that religion is based upon the feeling of absolute dependence, it follows that in this consciousness the infinite being of God is given with the being of self. This feeling springs from the sense of contingency in everything, wherefrom the self and the external universe are related back to a final ground, the deity. No cognition of God precedes this feeling but every judgment of God arises from it. God is the absolute unity of the ideal and the real. As we think only in antitheses, we can not apprehend the notion of God clearly in thought. Attributes of God do not represent real aspects of his being or activity but obtain only for the religious consciousness; the same is true of personality. Life, however, is the one thing necessary in God, whereby Schleiermacher escapes the inert idea of Spinoza. Pantheist he has been declared, not unjustly in view of such statements as that God could never have existed without the world. The unity of nature in relation to consciousness precludes interference or miracle. A determinist, freedom to him is no more than development of personality. Natural or rational religion is a mere abstraction. The various religions are representations of the idea of religion rising in scale according to the degree of the feeling of God and the elimination of differences in generalization. The influence of Schleiermacher must be taken as a wholesome reaction from the sterile rationalism and hard ethicism of the eighteenth century.

More one-sided is the view of religion of Hegel whose panlogistic or even pantheistic system is the

science of the evolving, absolute reason, whose evolution for thought and being is one and the same.

7. Hegel. Religion is a stage in the unfolding of spirit and takes its place in the last part of his philosophy of spirit, that of absolute spirit, which is the combination of the objective and subjective spirits. This means the spirit in the form with reference to self, and the spirit which objectifies itself in right, morality, and ethics. The absolute spirit reveals itself in the objective form of sense as art; in the subjective form of feeling and representation as religion in the narrower sense, while in the wider sense the absolute spirit is religion on the whole, and in the subjective-objective form of truth it is philosophy, which is the self-thinking Idea, the self-apprehending consciousness, the self-realizing truth. The content of religion is also truth; not as it appears to the really apprehending consciousness, but as it appears in the lower stages of representation as images and myths. Philosophy is to engage itself with religion as with art, either to operate or abolish it. This does not mean a degradation of religion, but that philosophy is to justify the exalted content of religion for the thinking consciousness and reason. Though he places representation in the forefront, this does not deny the place of feeling, which he occasionally strongly emphasizes. It is of importance to him that in feeling is the ground for the assumption of the existence of God, though inconceivable from this source; yet he would place it in the earliest stage of development. The different religions represent stages of development, of which the Christian only is the complete. Bound by his dialectic method of triads he finds three main divisions: the religion of nature, of spiritual individuality, and the absolute religion. Each of these has its three stages. The first includes the stage of immediate naturalism, that of the bifurcation of consciousness, where God the absolute power towers over the individual; and that of the transition to freedom. The second includes the religions in which God is viewed as subject; that of sublimity, the Jewish; that of beauty, the Greek; and of the practical, which is the Roman. Christianity is the absolute religion, knowing God as externalizing himself to finiteness and in unity with the finite; revealed, realizing that God comes to consciousness in the finite ego, first apprehending God as Spirit. The nature of spirit being to posit something outside of and then to re-enter self, three forms result: God, the eternal Idea in and with itself, the kingdom of the Father; the form of manifestation, the difference, the eternal Idea in consciousness and representation, which is the kingdom of the Son; the return to itself, the atonement, the kingdom of the Spirit. If a contradiction be pointed out in this idea of the Trinity, it remains that all the living is contradiction in itself and in the Idea the contradiction is resolved. Expressions in the idea of the Trinity objectionable to reason such as son, begotten, occur because representation can not free itself from the intuitions of sense.

The influence of Hegel in this field was more tremendous even than that of Schleiermacher. The left and right wings ranged themselves with reference to the position to be given to religion; whether, as basis of church doctrine, it was to retain its independent right, since Hegel had determined its content and that of philosophy as the same; or religious dogma was overthrown by philosophical concept. The one supported theism and individual immortality, the other took up pantheism, inasmuch as God came to self-consciousness only in man, and it accepted only the idea of the eternity of spirit in general. Distinguished on the left are D. F Strauss and L. A. Feuerbach (qq.v.). The former, in his *Leben Jesu* (1835–36) and *Glaubenslehre* (1840–41), taught that Hegel himself early overthrew the representative form; that Biblical narrative rested mostly on myths; that Christian dogmas had to exterminate themselves in their development; and that God was not a person but an infinite substance, thought in all the thinking, life in all the living, and existence in all being. Feuerbach illustrates in his sentence, "God was my first thought; reason my second, man my third and last," his passage from Hegelian pantheism to radical anthropomorphism or naturalism. In *Das Wesen des Christentums* (1841) religion and philosophy are claimed to be distinct, related like fancy or sensibility to thought, the sick to the healthy. Considering religion in humanity in its source, it is found that its object is not to know or represent but to satisfy. The necessities, the egoism, have so ordered religion that it has a thoroughly eudemonistic character. Man projects his own being into the infinite, places this opposite himself and reveres it as deity, in the hope of procuring his wishes otherwise unattainable. Feuerbach does not mean to deny God but to rescue his reality from theological contradictions and absurdities. His anthropomorphism is here evident, but also his naturalism in assigning as the ground of religion the feeling of dependence upon nature and its purpose to liberate itself from this. God is contrasted with nature, but the properties attributed to him are of nature. Many philosophical thinkers attached themselves to Hegel but compromised with Schleiermacher or pursued their own courses. E. Zeller places the origin of religion in the necessities of sense or fear and hope, but estimates its value by its importance for the spiritual life. Religion is to be comprehended as neither intellectual nor moral alone, but as pertaining to the whole life of man. In Wilhelm Vatke's *Religionsphilosophie* (1888) religion is attached essentially neither to morality nor reason, but is a state of the inner feeling concealing within itself an insoluble mystery, and employing itself with the perfection of the ethical personality, by the practical mediation of the finite with the infinite, or God. Most zealous and prolific in this department has been Otto Pfleiderer (q.v.), *Religionsphilosophie* (1878–94), who apprehends God as the Ego in distinction from all the finite, who at the same time has all things not in, but in subjection to, himself. Thus a monotheism is to be vindicated by the overthrow of deism and pantheism. A. O. Biedermann (q.v.), in successive works, holds that religion is not wholly a matter of the representative faculty, but includes also moments of volitional acts and

8. Post-Hegelian.

states of feeling. Infinity is the formal and spirituality is the material element, and the two together constitute the idea of God, the absolute Spirit, from which the idea of personality must be far removed. On the other side, C. H. Weisse, Herman Ulrici, and I. H. Fichte (q.v.) specially emphasize the personality of God and thus violently attack the Hegelian doctrine, although much indebted to it. With still greater positiveness, they threw themselves against materialism, but availed themselves of the idea of experience in order to bring philosophy nearer to theology. Their avowed object was to demonstrate a speculative theism.

9. Herbart and Lotze.

An altogether different course from that of Hegel was taken by J. F. Herbart, who wrote no religious philosophy, but expressed religious views sporadically in his works. Religious belief is to proceed from the view of nature. The higher organisms especially argue a designing intelligence, and it can not be safely assumed that this teleological feature exists only in representation and not in nature itself. Still, no binding proof of this intelligence can be adduced; a natural theology is impossible; and to bring the representative concept of God in comparison with nature or the real results in contradictions. Hence God can be more closely apprehended by the ethical predicates—wisdom, holiness, power, love, righteousness—derived from practical ideas but not adaptable to a pantheistic conception. Herbart has a high esteem for religion on account of its solacing and disciplinary efficacy. Wilhelm Drobisch (1840) carries out Herbart's position more fully, not without some impressions from Kant. The sense of impotence and limitation—physical, intellectual, and moral—gives rise to desire for liberation and the ascent above the finite. A divine existence is not only to be wished for but must be subject of proof for the sake of objective significance. The inadequate teleological argument must be supplemented by practical moral reasons of belief. The moral world-ideal is to be realized as the highest good; but this is possible only if God is the cause of that ideal as well as of the means in nature necessary to its realization. J. F. Fries, followed by E. F. Apelt and W. M. L. de Wette (q.v.), is notable for emphasizing the esthetic element for religious philosophy. In the beautiful and the sublime are viewed the finite as manifestation of the eternal. The esthetic view of the world subserves the ideas of faith. Of more recent thinkers the most influential in this connection is Hermann Lotze (q.v.), who produced no philosophy of religion but furnishes glimpses in his lectures and his "Microcosm." He does not find the main field of religious philosophy in the analysis of the moments of consciousness, but would inquire first how much light reason alone can afford concerning the supersensuous world, and then how far a revealed religious content may be combined with these fundamental principles. The central point for him is the existence of God, for which he, however, does not furnish adequate proofs. In support of it, he lays considerable stress upon a form of the ontological argument: it is impossible that the greatest thinkable object does not exist; therefore, there must be a greatest. The universal substance, at once the ground of the real and the ideal world, attains its full content first in the concept of God; and God may not be thought without personality, to which the antithesis to a non-ego or actual external world is not essential. Personality is spirit already when in antithesis with its own states; that is, with its own representations, it knows itself as the simple, uniting subject upon which they are merely contingent. The being of the personal God appears only imperfectly in the known, empirical personality; it must, in a measure, be superpersonal, whereby the concept of personality seems again to vanish. The relations of God to the universe, subjoined to the three categories of creation, preservation, and government, occasion the designation of attributes (see PROVIDENCE); of which the metaphysical determine God as the ground of all reality in the finite, and the ethical satisfy the desire to find in the supreme existence also the supreme values. The religious feeling transcends cognition, in that man apprehends himself as divine being, as united with God, who conditions his being and reveals himself in him. Here Lotze approximates pantheism as he does also in his metaphysics, inasmuch as, for him, the single substantial cosmic ground comprehends all individual realities. Gustav Glogaus, upon whose views a cult was established after his death, held that the existence of God was the summit of all philosophy. Its certainty is deduced from that of self-existence. From God are derived the ideas of the true, the beautiful, and the good, which constitute the essence of the spirits created by God after his image. Opposing extreme intellectualism, he regards feeling and experience of God as the essentials of religion. The same tendency as Lotze's is shown by Guenther Thiele, in *Die Philosophie des Selbstbewusstseins* (1895), depending also upon J. G. Fichte. At the root of the acts of the individual ego appearing in the succession of time is the absolute supertemporal Ego. The concept of God has its termination in the absolute Ego rising from animism to the god of the sun or the celestial sphere, and thence to the absolute substance, implying necessarily the concept of the all-wise and omnipotent Creator. Much deserving recognition has been accorded to Hermann Siebeck, who in his *Lehrbuch der Religionsphilosophie* (Freiburg, 1893) defined this subject to be the application of philosophy, as the science of the nature and activity of the spiritual life upon the fact of religion, for its particular, distinct formulation. He defines religion as the intellectual, emotional, and active practical conviction of the existence of God and the supramundane and, in connection therewith, of the possibility of redemption. The aim of science and metaphysics is to gain a knowledge of the ground of things and their unity as an impersonal subject, and it arrives at the idea of a spirit immanent in the world, which may, not inconsequently, be thought of as personality. On the other hand faith or religion concerns itself with the consciousness of a personal relation of man with the divine ground of things and with knowledge only so far as it mediates this consciousness. As this does not lie in the empirical world, therefore faith

postulates and seeks a personal highest and absolute beyond the empirical unity.

A diametrical opposite to the above is Eduard von Hartmann (q.v.) in his works on the philosophy of religion—*Das religiöse Bewusstsein der Menschheit im Stufengang seiner Entwickelung* and *Die Religion des Geistes* (1882), of which the first (historical-critical) part treated of the religious consciousness of humanity in the scale of its evolution and the second (systematic) part presented the "Religion of the Spirit." He puts the impersonality of God directly as postulate of the religious consciousness. Deity is for him as absolute Spirit one, and as such the absolute subsistence of the world. The consequence is cosmic monism; and this includes the real multiplicity as its internal manifold. From the ground of immanence is necessarily derived the impersonality of God. The world is in need of redemption; hence, pessimism is justified; but since the world is capable of redemption, teleological optimism is likewise warranted. At this point appeared a proposed total separation of religion or theology and metaphysics on the part of A. Ritschl (q.v.), and his followers, chief of whom are J. G. W Herrmann and J. Kaftan (qq.v.), who are more or less attached to Kant but do not place their value-judgments of the religious perception on the same plane with their ethical judgments and do not profess the derivation of these from them. These value-judgments call forth feelings of pleasure or displeasure, whereby man maintains his supremacy over the world which he acquired by the help of God, or dispenses with such help for this end. The religious truths or facts of redemption must be realized in experience, without which there is no religious certainty. Certainty of the reality of God is dependent on the experience of the divine operation in man, arousing feeling and will; a sense of sin and a desire for blessedness are present, to which correspond an angry God and a merciful God. Additional proofs of the existence of God can avail no more than the recognition of him as the supreme law of the world. Only the moral proof is of value. More influenced by Kant on the side of the theory of knowledge is R. A. Lipsius (q.v.), who lays stress upon the antithesis between the empirical dependence in the world and moral freedom within. Religion is the ascent of the spirit to inner freedom in transcendent dependence upon God; a reciprocal relation between God and man, based upon the authentication of the Spirit of God in the spirit of man or divine revelation. With ethics as the basis of religion he would break entirely.

10. Von Hartmann; Ritschl.

Among thinkers of most recent date philosophy of religion is placed on a par with science of religion. The Dutch scholar C. P. Tiele (q.v.) in *Elements of the Science of Religion*, Gifford Lectures, 1896–98 (2 vols., Edinburgh, 1897–99) and *Grundriss der Religionswissenschaft* (1904), in which he presents the two divisions of Morphology and Ontology of the Philosophy of Religion, took the ground that the philosophy of religion was neither philosophical dogma on religion, nor a confession of a so-called natural religion, nor that part of the old philosophy which dealt with the origin of things; but that it was a philosophical investigation of the universal phenomenon ordinarily called religion. It is to attempt to comprehend the religious in man, and thus announce its nature and establish its origin. For this purpose it is necessary to observe its historical evolution, its various tendencies, and the conditions and laws to which it is subject. An analysis is to follow; that is, a study of its various elements and revelations as psychological phenomena, in order to ascertain what is common and permanent in all religions. According to Tiele, religion is a spiritual state, or piety, which appears in word and act, representation and conduct, doctrine and life. Its nature is worship—religious respect to a superhuman, infinite power, as the basis of the existence of man and the world. Max Müller (q.v.) lays far more stress upon the historical, especially comparative history. He has the distinction of bringing into the science of religion the service of philology. True philosophy of religion is to him nothing else than the history of religion. He defines religion as the realization of the infinite, which he amends later, to the effect that only such realizations of the infinite come under the category of religion as are capable of influencing the ethical character of man. George Runze, who emphasizes the philological basis in his *Sprache und Religion* (1889), would condition all thinking by the nature of language to construct metaphor and myth. Recently an abundant literature has sprung up. In Holland, L. W. E. Rauwenhoff, *Religionsphilosophie* (Brunswick, 1887), postulates belief in the supersensible. Much recognized has been L. A. Sabatier's (q.v.) *Esquisse d'une philosophie de la religion d'après la psychologie et l'histoire* (Paris, 1897; 6th ed., 1907; Eng. transl., *Outlines of Religious Philosophy based on Psychology and History*, London, 1897), the tendency of which is shown by the title. In England Edward Caird in the *Evolution of Religion*, Gifford Lectures, 1890–92 (Glasgow, 1893), presents the religious principle as a necessary element of consciousness; John Caird (q.v.) in *Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion* attempts to reconcile faith and knowledge; and G. J. Romanes in *Thoughts on Religion* (London, 1895) would combine the doctrine of evolution with the concept of God. Among Italians, L. Valli, in *Il fundamento psicologico della Religione* (1904), has treated the subject in an individual but very sensible manner.

11. Contemporary Thought.

II. Analysis of Religion: After this historical review, it is in order to assume a position in regard to certain questions already raised: Is, on the whole, a philosophy of religion warranted? Is it necessary? As soon as a scientific philosophic investigation is opened the religious side becomes a subject of inquiry, otherwise an element of first importance would be absent from human knowledge. Besides, philosophy of religion must constitute a part of the whole philosophic system. Philosophy of religion as such in name dates from the close of the eighteenth century. Previously its problems were treated in connection with metaphysics or ethics. Its position is properly after the series composed of metaphysics,

1. Method.

psychology, and, possibly, after ethics and esthetics. If it forms the conclusion of the philosophic series, then it is also the climax, since it pertains to the most momentous transactions of the soul-life. As to the division, the first step is an investigation of what is essential in all religions, upon a historical and psychological basis. This is to include not only what appeals to the susceptibility of a refined religious consciousness, but everything to which a possible standard of value may be applied to what constitutes the essence of religion from the lowest stages of development to the highest. As there is no common definition of religion, it depends upon every individual investigator how far he will extend the inclusive limits of religious phenomena, hoping that he may not be too much at variance with universal opinion. If the nature of religion in its essence is presumably found, the next step is to estimate the truth-value of religion and the representations formulated by religious persons. Should this vanish wholly and only an estimate of feeling remain, such representations could not maintain even this, for the intellect might possibly present them as nugatory. Here is the point of contact with metaphysics.

The activities and processes in the human soul are to be viewed in the threefold distinction of representation (cognition), feeling, and will; though it is understood that these are operated by the soul in complex combinations. This

2. Representation. division is of advantage, since the three leading modern contributors to the problem distinguish themselves accordingly: Kant representing the religion of ethics or will; Schleiermacher, of feeling; and Hegel, of the intellect. That religion was a matter of representation, thought, knowledge, was always held, and intellectualism prevailed from the age of Socrates. Wherever religion has been recognized representations play their part, and generally of a superhuman being; in the highly developed forms, of the transcendent spiritual being, God, the One. However, does the possession of truth, even the highest, constitute religion? Aristotle claimed knowledge of the prime Mover of things, but was not therefore religious. If any one knew God and divine things from the innermost unity of nature, if he even possessed absolute certainty of the beyond, and yet did not realize a relation with this supramundane or universal, or had not reconciled the variance between the infinite and himself the finite, or did not at least make the attempt, he would not possess what is called religion. Not even if for knowledge were substituted faith in the usual sense; that is not submission to the superhuman, but the lower step, as in the Alexandrine sense of " faith " in comparison with " knowledge." He could not be called pious, because the attitude toward the higher or highest is not yet present. Every religion develops representations, which supplant metaphysics. The mystic sets the highest before his mind, before he sinks into it; the Buddhist must have representation of Nirvana; yet either is concerned about something wholly different.

Feeling, on the other hand, plays a part, without which a religion is unthinkable. This occurs first in a sense of dependence, which may be upon any incidental object to which power is ascribed (fetish); or a useful or harmful part of nature

3. Feeling. (animal worship, star-cult, Sabaism, and perhaps animism); or nature with its inflexible laws as a whole, regarded either as animate or as pure mechanism (naturalism, Stoicism, Spinoza); or upon spirits, particularly of the deceased (ancestor-worship, and with it totemism). See Comparative Religion. Many like Herbert Spencer would derive all religion from the revering of the departed or ancestors. The mythological gods probably originated from the personification of the powers of nature, as at a later stage the gods of the myths were allegorically reversed to powers of nature. By knowledge of his dualistic nature, man could conceive of the powers as persons and as spiritual, not without some degree of material form. The final view was that the infinite greatness and power over all was a spirit upon whom man was in all things dependent, yet possessing a certain self-existence and freedom. With these representations of the powers or of dependence upon them, feelings are bound up, either of like or dislike. The latter may accompany a representation of the contraction of human power and the diminution of the sense of self, and become strong aversion, such as fear of impending natural calamity. This feeling is still more intensified, if the sense of guilt be added. If feeling of dependence involves no more than fear, it is not religion. In the religious fear of God the element is much reduced, and the sense passes over into obedience and reverence. Neither can it be said that fear created the gods, because it must have been preceded by the representation of superhuman powers. The sense of fear or the resultant pain, physical or spiritual, leads to liberation from necessity, or salvation, which is hoped for or petitioned from the deities. This hope of salvation, which may pass over into certainty, is bound up with great joy over the sense that a beneficent power watches over man, so that no harm can befall him. A mode of fellowship or union with God develops, though not necessarily mystical; a vanishing of consciousness, though not a theosis; but a complete rest in God, the state of being hid in him, which constitutes blessedness. This is the climax of religion; it is joy without end. The feeling of dependence which starts with the utmost displeasure culminates with the highest bliss of submission to God, of the dissolution of personality, as in Buddhism; in Christianity the union with God in the celestial. The ultimate aim of religion is thus a feeling of good fortune, to use the expression; and as a practical concern of human spirit, religion thus corresponds to ethics.

If this be the case, desire next claims consideration with reference to the nature of religion. It must be admitted that religious phenomena in their evolution can not be understood without the activity of the will. Necessity, or the

4. Will. desire to escape it, impels to a relation with the highest principle, by which liberation, salvation from evil, or even the escape from individual isolation from God are sought

First, the desire seeks earthly goods, then the higher, for this life and the next. Beside and above physical necessity appear mental anxiety, earnest concern for the safety of the soul, and the desire for individual immortality. Necessity begets prayer. Sacrifices for the most part represent the effort to avert necessity. Specially active appear the religious phenomena when the moral precepts are taken as the commands of God, and their violation obscures the relation with the divine, or threatens with estrangement from God. Painful remorse results; in the lower stages with fear of punishment here or hereafter, in the upper in view of the inner longing for the highest. The ethical life may lose its self-dependence and be absorbed in the religious or at least be intimately complicated with it. At all events, in the case of a man who is inwardly religious, morality can not subsist without religion, but he must also be moral in practise. The religious state of life will then include all of man's activity, all of life; so that it may be observed as a continuous service to God. A conclusion of religiousness can not be made from acts which outwardly seem moral, not even those known as the forms of worship, often divided into prayer and sacrifice. To these performances belong the most manifold ceremonies, which are characteristic of all religions, and are, in part, symbolic in significance. For the greater multitude, the essential in religion manifests itself in these forms of worship; and, though they can not originate, they may reinforce the content, specially in communal fellowship. As the incorporation of the religious spirit of the community, they are symbols of unity as well as the medium of consensus on articles of belief. Through both, objective religion is constituted. It is striking how those who have rejected the previous metaphysics and all objective religion, like A. Comte, nevertheless revert to the construction of a ritual to the minutest detail, embracing both prayer and sacrament. Outward worship, though indispensable to objective religion, is not absolutely such to subjective religion. Those who realize supreme satisfaction in inner communion with the highest superhuman and feel themselves freed from all bodily and spiritual necessities may be said to possess religion, although they do not bring their inner states to outward representative acts of manifestation. For many the external must be regarded as a great aid in mediating the subjective with its supreme infinite object, though it be not regarded as essential. Self-expression is only natural, and the continued association of form with spirit clothes it with a validity that seems indispensable to the inner life.

5. Generalization.

To generalize from the foregoing, it may be said that religion pertains to the entire soul-life. It is practical not theoretical; though the latter is warranted in the sphere of representation. The religious process opening with a feeling of necessity proceeds to desire of relief and happiness, and culminates in the reconciliation of the aim with the transcendent or immanent infinite. Optimism and pessimism are thus interrelated. Redemption (or salvation) is the most adequate term in the religious vocabulary. It implies first something to be released from, then, in succession, the inclination, the inmost yearning, and the final attainment. Law and Gospel, sin and grace, are the antitheses in Christianity, to be reconciled in salvation; the latter appearing also in Buddhism, although, as also in the Kantian ethics, here man must save himself. Although the common principle of all religions, from the lowest fetishism, is the aspiration for redemption, yet the representation of the higher powers as the objective of the desire is very much diversified; variously, according to geographical situation, customs, stages of civilization, as also the creative imagination, and, specially, according to the tremendous influence of divinely gifted personalities as mediators of a revelation, who deepen, illumine, and inspire, not only the representations but also the entire religious life. In Christianity thus is presented the God-man as Redeemer. Though representations are indispensable to religion, subjective and objective, yet they can not claim to belong to the concept or essence of religion. Monotheism may or must be assumed to satisfy religious requirement; yet it is not exclusively the only religious form. In the sphere of representation evolution takes place, while the essential remains constant. On the whole, it is to be assumed that evolution was ascending toward the purer and more spiritual; but it is uncertain whether the original form was not monotheistic, and there was a downward process. Ethnic religions would not then be primitive, but degenerate growths. To regard henotheism as primitive is impossible because it can occur only with polytheism. Proper is it, indeed, not to assume only one primitive form but various forms that have developed gradually in different zones.

6. Relative Estimation.

To estimate the relative truth-value of religion, it is necessary to distinguish between the religions that turn toward a higher universal for redemption and those that seek it by themselves. The latter are represented by Buddhism, although this soon, for the greater masses, reverted to the other form.

The question of truth depends on whether its aim is actualized, and there is no doubt that this comes to reality in experience. The same standard must hold true for the other religions as well. However, there is involved also in this estimation of the true reality of a religion its relation to the representations of its highest being or beings. The question would then be whether the representations correspond to the reality which philosophical thought professes to attain. In monotheistic faiths and Christianity, which are regarded as the highest forms, a foremost subject of consideration is the existence of God with reference to which the community is to be established, and its closer determination. Briefly, scientific thought arrives at the certain assumption of a being, which is absolute, infinite, and as such is unity, and is all-inclusive, even of man. If man finds himself constrained to regard the ultimate elements of being, as analogous to his subjective self, to be apprehended as spiritual, inasmuch as this is immediately given in consciousness and matter dissolves in the effort to con-

ceive it, then infinite being as such is spiritual, and man has his ground in the infinite spiritual Being, and is dependent upon it. If the religious consciousness assumes this final universal as God, it is easy to regard the same as transcendent, without this being essential for religion. If it further ascribes to God personality and ethical attributes, these involve the conception of the being of God in contradictions, and can not define the same metaphysically; they become matters of faith, or objective conceptions adaptable to human need, whose satisfaction may be regarded as necessary; but according to their content these determinations defy proof. The intellectual proofs for the divine existence from the time of Aristotle, as also the apologetic arguments, are not final. Most convincing is the teleological, yet this halts before the evidence of much that is not purposive, and before evil in the world, which is regarded by the religious as belonging to the plan of the whole and is overcome, but not convincingly explained, by intellectual thought. The weakest is the moral argument, which assumes unproved premises. Though not final, these arguments at most increase probability. Proofs for other specifically religious, in a measure Christian, dogmas, such as that of the Trinity, are still less convincing. Here appeal must be made to faith, not to reason. See RELIGION; GOD, IV.

(M. HEINZE†.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: For the history of the philosophy of religion consult: J. Berger, *Geschichte der Religionsphilosophie*, Berlin, 1800; C. Bartholmess, *Hist. critique des doctrines religieuses de la philosophie moderne*, 2 vols., Paris, 1855; A. Stöckl, *Lehrbuch der Religionsphilosophie*, Mainz, 1878; B. Pünjer, *Geschichte der christlichen religionsphilosophie seit der Reformation*, 2 vols., Brunswick, 1880–1883; idem, *Grundriss der Religionsphilosophie*, ib. 1886; G. Runze, *Der ontologische Gottesbeweis. Kritische Darstellung seiner Geschichte*, Halle, 1881; H. K. H. Delff, *Grundzüge der Entwickelungsgeschichte der Religion*, Leipsic, 1883; A. Gilliot, *Études historiques et critiques sur les religions et institutions comparées*, Paris, 1883; L. Carran, *La Philosophie religieuse en Angleterre depuis Locke jusqu'à nos jours*, Paris, 1898; O. Pfleiderer, *Religionsphilosophie auf geschichtlicher Grundlage*, 3d ed., Berlin, 1896, Eng. transl., *Philosophy of Religion on the Basis of its History*, 4 vols., London, 1897; idem, *Philosophy of Religion*, 2 vols., London, 1894 (Gifford Lectures); A. Caldecott, *The Philosophy of Religion, in England and America*, London, 1901; N. H. Marshall, *Die gegenwärtigen Richtungen der Religionsphilosophie in England und ihre erkenntnisstheoretischen Grundlagen*, Berlin, 1902.

For studies in the philosophy of religion consult: J. Matter, *Philosophie de la religion*, 2 vols., Paris, 1857; A. M. Fairbairn, *Studies in the Philosophy of Religion and History*, London, 1876; I. Richard, *Essai de philosophie religieuse*, Heidelberg, 1877; H. Lotze, *Grundzüge der Religionsphilosophie*, Leipsic, 1882; J. Martineau, *Study of Religion, its Sources and Contents*, Oxford, 1888; idem, *Seat of Authority in Religion*, 2d ed., London, 1890; R. Seydl, *Religionsphilosophie in Umriss*, Freiburg, 1893; J. Caird, *Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion*, 6th ed., Glasgow, 1896; A. Sabatier, *Esquisse d'une philosophie de la religion*, 7th ed., Paris, 1903, Eng. transl. of earlier ed., *Outlines of a Philosophy of Religion*, London, 1897; F. Engels, *Religion, philosophie, socialisme*, Paris, 1901; R. Eucken, *Der Wahrheitsgehalt der Religion*, Leipsic, 1901; A. Dorner, *Grundriss der Religionsphilosophie*, Leipsic, 1903; G. Galloway, *Studies in the Philosophy of Religion*, Edinburgh, 1904; E. Tröltsch, in *Die Philosophie zu Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts, Festschrift für Kuno Fischer*, pp. 104–162, Heidelberg, 1904; J. Watson, *Philosophical Basis of Religion*, Glasgow, 1907; B. Wehnert, *Wissenschaft, Philosophie, Kunst und Religion*, Dortmund, 1910. Much of the literature in and under RELIGION is pertinent.

RELIGION, PRIMITIVE. See COMPARATIVE RELIGION, VI., 1.

RELIGIOUS CORPORATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES.

Legal Basis (§ 1).
Method of Incorporation (§ 2).
Corporations Sole and Aggregate (§ 3).
Objects of Incorporation (§ 4).
Powers (§ 5).

The corporation formed for the purposes of religion is an important element in American ecclesiastical organization. The American religious corporation differs in origin, function, and power from the ecclesiastical corporation known to European law which is the product of canon law, and has been developed by analogy from the corporation of the civil law based upon the Roman law. It is not an American development of the English legal ecclesiastical corporation, which is composed entirely of ecclesiastical persons and subject to ecclesiastical judicatories. The religious corporation in the United States belongs to the class of civil corporations, not for profit, which are organized and controlled according to the principles of common law and equity as administered by the civil courts. Distinction is necessary between the corporation and the religious society or church with which it may be connected. The church is a spiritual and ecclesiastical body, and as such does not receive incorporation. It is from the membership of the religious society that the corporation is formed. The corporation exercises its functions for the welfare of the church body, over which, however, it has no control. It can not alter the faith of the church, or receive or expel members, or dictate relations with other church bodies. While the religious corporation is frequently organized to carry on some religious enterprise without connection with a local church body, the greater number of religious corporations in the United States are directly connected with some local church body, and it is in this connection that their powers and duties will be considered.

1. Legal Basis.

Only a sovereign power can create a corporation, and this power now rests with the legislative branch of the state governments and of the federal government. Prior to the American revolution religious corporations were created either by royal charter or by provincial authority derived from the crown. After the revolution they were incorporated either by special acts of the state legislatures or under the provisions of general statutes. In its charter are contained the organic law of a corporation and the legal evidence of its right to the exercise of corporate franchises. When incorporation is effected under the provisions of a general statute, the terms of such a statute applicable to that particular corporation are by law read into its charter. Such a charter is a grant of powers by the State, and it also has the nature of a contract in such a sense that it can not thereafter be altered or revoked without the consent of the corporation unless the State has reserved to itself the right so to alter or revoke. The general statutes under which

2. Method of Incorporation.

religious corporations can now be formed in most of the American states contain provisions authorizing the legislature to alter, amend, or repeal any charter granted. Another limitation of corporate powers is that charters granted to corporations by the State may be seized either for non-use or misuse of powers. Further, the granting of a charter does not prevent a state from exercising to a reasonable extent its police or judicial powers. In some states the duration or life of a religious corporation is limited by statute. If no limit is specified, the corporation may enjoy a perpetual existence. The life of a religious corporation dates in law from its organization, not from the time it began to exercise its corporate powers. That a religious corporation is a corporation *de facto* may be proved by showing the existence of a charter at a prior time, or by showing some law under which it could have been created and an actual use of the rights claimed to have been conferred. Where such a body has for a number of years and in good faith exercised the privileges of a corporation, its legal incorporation will be presumed. If the statute which provides for the incorporation of religious societies does not make incorporation obligatory upon such societies but merely prescribes the mode of incorporation, in case there is no evidence that a society took any of the steps prescribed or assumed to act as a corporation, its incorporation under the statute will not be presumed. But a mere use of corporate powers limited to the maintenance of religious observances is not sufficient to establish a corporation *de facto* (Van Buren vs. Reformed Church, 62 Barb. N. Y. 495).

Classified as to the number of natural persons vested with corporate powers, religious corporations are either aggregate or sole. By far the greater number are aggregate, composed of three or more persons. The corporation sole is found where one person holding an ecclesiastical office is by law vested with all the attributes of a corporation. Such corporate attributes attach to the office and pass to each succeeding incumbent, thereby maintaining continuously the life of the corporation. During a vacancy in the ecclesiastical office the law regards the corporate functions as suspended merely and not as destroyed. The ecclesiastical corporation sole has not been favored in American legislation. It is expressly forbidden in the states of Delaware, Michigan, New York, and Pennsylvania. It is provided for by statute in the states of Oregon and New Jersey. Massachusetts and several other states have granted charters of incorporation to single church officials by special legislative acts. The object of the churches in securing such incorporations was to make more effective certain features of their polities. Incorporation of this kind has been sought by denominations having an episcopal form of polity. Thus the Oregon statute provides for the granting of corporate powers to bishops, overseers, and presiding elders. The composition of the religious corporations aggregate depends upon the provisions of the statute in each state, and in this matter the states are broadly divided. The language of many statutes is to the effect that any religious society or church may become incorporated by following a prescribed procedure. The language of other statutes is to the effect that religious societies or churches having appointed or elected trustees, the same may become a civil corporation. This difference is not as radical as would appear, for in cases where the law permits churches to be incorporated, provision is made for the election or appointment of trustees in whom are vested the corporate functions, thereby leaving to the church body the sole duty of producing such trustees. Under either system the corporations have the same functions in law. In a number of states supplemental provisions have been enacted to provide corporations composed of certain officials for the benefit of churches of particular denominations.

3. Corporations Sole and Aggregate.

The primary object of religious incorporation in the United States is the care of real property devoted to the purposes of religion. In the corporation as such is vested the title to church property. Along with the vesting of such title go all the attributes of legal ownership, to be exercised, however, solely for the benefit of the religious body which the corporation serves. In this relation the corporation is a trustee and the church is the party with the full beneficial interest. While the corporation so serves the church, it is not within the jurisdiction of the church judicatories, but is responsible for the proper performance of its duties to the civil courts, before whom it may be brought by any party in interest. The courts have recognized, in addition to the primary trust for the holding of specific property and its right use for the benefit of a certain religious body, religious corporations as possessing the inherent capacity of executing additional trusts of a distinctly religious, charitable, or educational nature if not too far removed from the primary object of the particular corporation acting as trustee. With this sanction many special trust funds have developed in the hands of local religious corporations. The dissolution of a local church body does not cause the dissolution of the corporation so long as there is real property to be held or transferred or trusts to be administered.

4. Objects of Incorporation.

In order properly to perform their functions religious corporations are now vested with ample powers. The granting of increased powers was a marked feature of legislation during the second half of the nineteenth century. Conspicuous was the increase in the amount of real property which religious corporations might hold. Moreover, all the normal powers of private corporations have been recognized as belonging to religious corporations. Specifically, these corporations have power to preserve their existence by filling vacancies. They may for their own government adopt by-laws, which, however, may not be inconsistent either with the provisions of the statute under which the corporation was organized or with the rules adopted by the church body with which the corporation is connected. If the local church is a member of some denominational organization, the by-laws of a local

5. Powers.

religious corporation may contain nothing adverse to the denominational connection of the local church body. If a corporation is found to have adopted such by-laws, the remedy is in the civil courts where such by-laws and all corporate acts based upon them will be nullified. Another power is that of adopting and using a corporate seal. This seal is affixed to all formal documents signed by the officers of the corporation as such and should appear over all instruments intended to bind the corporation. The religious corporation must act as a body in regular meeting. The separate and individual acts of members of the corporation, even though such acts are by a majority of the whole number, are not binding upon the corporation and can not of themselves create corporate liability. A power either specifically granted or necessarily implied is that of purchasing, leasing, exchanging, or mortgaging all forms of real property, provided that such property is necessary and convenient for the purposes of the church body. This question is decided by the civil courts alone. A religious corporation may not engage in business transactions for profit. It may, however, hold revenue-producing property, not used by the church, as investment in the form of an endowment. It has the implied if not the express right to contract money obligations to be evidenced by bonds or notes. The mortgaging of real property by a religious corporation generally requires the consent of some superior ecclesiastical authority, as well as an order of court. Because one of the objects of religious incorporation is to give a legal person standing in court, such corporations have the right to sue and be sued, to plead and be impleaded, in courts of law and of equity. It is in the civil courts and not in the ecclesiastical courts that the religious corporation has standing; and it is from the civil courts that orders or writs will issue, directing or restraining corporate action. A corporation has the right to be represented by counsel, and the necessary cost of litigation is recognized as a legitimate expense. Unlike private corporations, the religious corporation can neither merge nor dissolve without the consent of the local church body and the higher church authorities. The statutes provide when and how there can be a consolidation of such corporations, and also under what circumstances a religious corporation can proceed to its own dissolution.

The American law of religious corporations has developed largely with reference to local churches; yet the practise of incorporation by superior ecclesiastical bodies and by special organizations, such as mission and educational boards, has become general. These general corporations do not differ in their legal character from the local corporations; but because their property interests are widely distributed throughout the possessions of the United States and in foreign lands, they come more often under the jurisdiction of the federal courts and the tribunals of foreign countries.

GEORGE JAMES BAYLES.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: W. H. Roberts, *Laws Relating to Religious Corporations: Collection of the general Statutes of the States and Territories*, Philadelphia, 1896; *Laws Relating to General Religious and Non-Business Corporations* (New York), Albany, 1899; R. C. Cumming, *Membership and Religious Corporations*, ed. A. J. Danaher, ib. 1900–04; C. T. Carr, *General Principles of the Law of Corporations*, New York, 1905.

RELIGIOUS DRAMAS.

Origins and Earliest Specimens (§ 1).
Gradual Extension of Action (§ 2).
Rise of Objections; Vernacular Plays (§ 3).
Increasing Elaborateness of Production (§ 4).
Literary Style; Corpus Christi Plays and Moralities (§ 5).
Early Protestant Attitude (§ 6).
The Oberammergau Passion Play (§ 7).
The Christmas Plays (§ 8).

The religious drama, as setting forth events recorded in the Bible or moral lessons to be drawn from religious teaching, is distinctively medieval in character, and in origin is closely connected with the services of the Church. At a very early period a quasi-dramatic effect was given by the division of the choir into antiphonal semi-choruses and in the responses of the congregation to the clergy, though it was not until the tenth century that there was any approximation to dramatic action. Then, however, tropes, or texts interpolated during the service, as in the introit, were added, the oldest specimens being contained in a St. Gall manuscript of about 900. In many monasteries the crucifixion and resurrection were dramatically represented from Good Friday to Easter; and the custom thus inaugurated received accretion after accretion, such as a scene between Mary Magdalene and Christ, added in the twelfth century. In like manner the antiphon and the trope sung at Christmas gave rise to a little drama, probably modeled on the Easter playlet, the earliest Easter tropes extant dating from the eleventh century; and similar provision was made for the feasts of Holy Innocents and Epiphany. As a specimen the little drama acted on the latter feast may be described. Three of the clergy, robed as kings, came from three sides of the church and met at the altar, whence they solemnly proceeded, with a star swinging before them from a cord, to the crib, where they were received by two priests vested in dalmatics. Having offered their gifts, they were warned by an angel (a white-robed boy) to escape the wrath of Herod, whereupon they made their exit from the church through the transept. A combination of Christmas, Holy Innocents, and Epiphany was also effected by having the three kings brought before Herod while on their way to Bethlehem, the introduction of that king giving the moment of opposition and thus inaugurating true dramatic life in Christian drama. Yet another drama was evolved from a homily attributed to Augustine and read as a lesson on Christmas. Assailing the Jews for their stubborn refusal to hear their own prophets concerning the Christ, the opportunity was afforded, in the eleventh century, of presenting not only the prophets, but also Vergil (on account of the fourth Eclogue), Nebuchadrezzar, and the Sibyl. The feasts of the Annunciation, Easter Monday, and the Ascension gave rise to minor dramas; while the dramatic representation of eschatological events, e.g., the wise and foolish virgins, traces its origin to the gospel for the twenty-fourth Sunday after Pentecost, the last of the church year.

1. Origins and Earliest Specimens.

In all this the Church endeavored not only to provide a substitute for pagan and secular plays, but also to teach the masses, who were ignorant of Latin, the lessons of Scripture and doctrine which they would not otherwise comprehend. The gradual extension of the text gave increasing independence of diction, and new passages in prose and poetry were gradually added to the mosaic of passages from the Bible and the chants of the Church which make up the oldest religious plays. The richness of the popular Latin poetry of the period is a component in the *Daniel* of Abelard's pupil Hilarius, the first definite personality in the history of the religious drama (b., probably in England, about the middle of the twelfth century), as well as in the eleventh century *Antichrist,* preserved in a manuscript from the monastery of Tegernsee. Beginning with the twelfth century the Easter plays manifest a tendency to extend the time of action, one of the early thirteenth century beginning with the calling of Peter and Andrew, and, though now ending abruptly with the negotiations between Pilate and Joseph of Arimathea concerning the sepulcher of Christ, once evidently carried on to the resurrection. This is, accordingly, the oldest specimen thus far known of the Passion play, which was to become the chief theme of medieval drama; but this type was not developed from the liturgy for Good Friday in the same sense as the Easter play from the liturgy for Easter, the deep solemnity of Good Friday forbidding free play to dramatic imagination. The twelfth century also witnessed the rise of dramas dealing with the saints, although these seem to have been intended primarily for schools, since they all deal with St. Nicholas, the patron of younger pupils, with the exception of one, which is devoted to St. Catherine, the patron of the older scholars.

2. Gradual Extension of Action.

The departure of the religious drama from its original limits was unpleasant to some of the more rigorous, and complaints were made as early as the twelfth century, when Gerhoh of Reichersberg and Abbess Herrad of Landsberg both attacked the drama as the work of the devil, the latter especially objecting that, while the plays were laudable and useful in their primary form, they had degenerated into irreligion and license. The costuming of monks as warriors, women, and devils, instead of symbolic renderings of the rôles, was evidently offensive, and the abbess particularly objected to the horse-play, thus evidencing a further departure from classic models in the melodramatic mingling of comic and tragic elements. The production of plays in churches was finally forbidden, though the prohibition seems to have been aimed at unworthy productions rather than at religious dramas proper, the latter being expressly excepted from condemnation in the decretals of Gregory ("Decretals," book III., tit. i., chap. xii.).

The first traces of the use of the vernacular in religious dramas date from the twelfth century. In Germany this was effected by a spoken German paraphrase following the chanted Latin sentence, and with the triumph of the vernacular over Latin also went the gradual supremacy of spoken over chanted lines. The earliest extant specimen of the vernacular religious drama is the twelfth-century French *Adam.* A number of French dramas of the saints have also been preserved, the most important of which is the *St. Nicholas* of Jean Bodel of Arras (c. 1200), which, as in the later romantic style, combines religious, knightly, and imaginative elements with a realistically burlesque presentation of everyday life. A later cycle of dramas shows how the Virgin miraculously intervenes in time of need or danger to succor those who adore her. The grotesque element comes to the fore in certain fourteenth-century German Easter plays, especially in those scenes where Satan, having lost so many souls through the descent of Christ to hell, sends the devil to recoup, this affording an opportunity for the satirization of the most varied estates of man. To the same period belongs the play of *The Wise and Foolish Virgins,* an eschatological drama. No texts of religious dramas in England have been preserved from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, though it is certain that such plays were then produced; and the only Spanish play of the period is a fragment of an Epiphany drama of the twelfth century, which, like the French *Adam,* is a very early specimen of the vernacular religious drama. In Italy the beginnings of national religious drama came, not from the Latin liturgy, but from the songs, rich in dialogue, of the Flagellants of the thirteenth century (see Flagellation, Flagellants, II., § 5); and apparently after the Flagellant brotherhoods had been permanently organized, the dramatic elements of their songs were given appropriate theatrical action.

3. Rise of Objections; Vernacular Plays.

Though numerous specimens have been preserved of the Latin drama, which may be said to have come to an end about 1200, few examples survive of the national plays of the oldest period (1200–1400), so that their process of development must remain uncertain; yet the dramatic merit of even the earliest vernacular plays is far superior to the Latin mysteries of the closing medieval period. In the cities the presentations became more imposing and the casts larger; in the great squares were erected stages, the location permitting the action to proceed without needing change of scenery; above was the throne of God and heaven, whence angels could descend to aid the good; and at the end of the stage was the abyss of hell, from which figures of grotesque devils constantly ascended. Since such productions required fair weather, the time of presentation tended to abandon the seasons of Christmas and Easter; and with increasing frequency the time of action extended throughout the earthly life of Christ, or even from the creation to the last day, the actual time of presentation now covering several days. This growth also involved the increasing introduction of the laity, although the clergy jealously arrogated to themselves the preparation of texts and the training of actors. The presentation of a religious drama, moreover, was held to be essentially pleasing to God, and was often motived either by thanksgiving for

4. Increasing Elaborateness of Production.

divine protection or to deprecate threatening calamity, while occasionally indulgences were attached to such presentations. While the educational purpose, already noted, was frequently stressed, there are only rare allusions to the moral influence of the plays, although it is once remarked that sinners would be terrified by the tortures of the damned or of those in purgatory represented on the stage. The cycles dealing with the saints often advocated openly the veneration of their heroes, and the Passion plays were designed to awaken a living sympathy with the agony of Christ and to call forth the grace of tears; while the plea was also advanced that man needs amusement, and that the religious drama was better adapted for this than many other forms of enjoyment. There is scant trace in the Middle Ages of the modern scruples against the dramatic representation of sacred themes, and the attitude in general toward them finds its modern counterpart in the Oberammergau Passion Play.

Not only was the medieval playwright gifted with scanty dramaturgic art, but the length of time and the number of rôles at his disposal led him into prolixity and unessential details. In the psychology of the leading parts and in the evolving of motives, he was mainly dependent on the theologians, especially those of the contemplative school who had pondered long upon the Passion. From these sources are borrowed such pathetic scenes as that in which the Virgin intrusts Christ to the care of the traitor Judas, and also scenes of horror. The greatest originality is displayed in comic scenes, although the wit here was of a breadth that sometimes caused the clergy to interfere. Thus, in the scene of the crucifixion, the Jews executed a grotesque song and dance with exaggerated caricatures of contemporary Jewish characteristics; and the beggars and cripples on whom the saints worked miracles likewise came in for their share of satire. In criticizing medieval religious dramas, however, it must be borne in mind that their authors did not aim at literary style, but only at the conversion from narrative to drama of their Biblical and legendary themes. Yet even the weakest plays mirror forth the thought of their time; and the uniformity of development in various countries likewise finds its explanation in the common source, the Latin literature of the Church, as well as in the uniform religious conditions prevailing throughout Western Christendom, not in international communication.

5. Literary Style; Corpus Christi Plays and Moralities.

International communication did, however, have some part, and the people here most concerned were the French, among whom the religious drama, here called "mystery," attained its richest and highest development, aided by dramas of the legends of the saints, especially those in which their intercession aids those who venerate them, these dramas of the saints being specifically termed "miracle plays." Yet another form of religious drama was evolved from the Corpus Christi processions dating from the latter part of the thirteenth century. Here it became possible to represent the entire history of the world, the division of the presentation between the various gilds and parishes heightening the magnificence of the whole, especially as the different scenes were given at designated places along the route. This form of drama reached its zenith in England, as in the "York plays," Spain not coming to the fore until much later. The older Latin liturgical dramas still lingered on, though steadily declining until they disappeared altogether, except for a few modern attempts at revival.

In addition to plots taken from the Bible and legend, the later Middle Ages developed the allegorical drama, or "morality." The idea of a conflict between the virtues and the vices was, indeed, no new one, but the first dramas built upon such plots date from the last decades of the fourteenth century, and reached perfection only in the fifteenth century, especially in France, the Netherlands, and England. To this category belongs, for example, the English *Everyman*, showing how each one, in his progress to the judgment of God, is deserted by kindred, wealth, and friends, only Good Deeds clinging to him. A variant of the moralities was afforded by the dance of death, apparently first devised by a preacher, probably a Franciscan, to illustrate the power of death over all classes, each of which, represented by a character appropriately costumed, holds dialogue with death before passing to the grave.

The spread of the Reformation naturally affected the religious drama. The adherents of the ancient faith redoubled their zeal in France in the production of mysteries, but the civil authorities no longer were as favorable as in the past; many points, such as the coarse jests of the comic scenes, were now regarded as exposed to Protestant attack; the Roman Catholics themselves, under the literary influence of the school of Ronsard, came to regard the medieval drama as barbarous and devoid of style; and there was apprehension of the faulty presentation of the doctrines of the Church. The attitude of the Calvinists was at first not unfavorable to the religious drama, but about 1570 the position changed, and the synods of Nîmes (1572) and Figeac (1579) condemned them. In German Switzerland the Protestants took delight in religious dramas until late in the sixteenth century, and Luther, at least once supported by Melanchthon, expressly approved them if presented reverently and without unseemly levity. The numerous German dramas now written were modeled largely on Terence and on the Latin school-plays based on the Bible; and the best specimen of this type, the *Acolastus* of Gnapheus, based on the parable of the prodigal son, was produced in 1529, while an English translation was published by John Palsgrave in 1540. The Protestant religious drama likewise mingled polemic elements in its plots, the priests of Baal in Old-Testament plays being favorite covers for attacks on the Roman Catholic clergy. This spirit, however, was especially manifest in the moralities from the earliest decades of the Reformation period. An entire cycle of French moralities represent sick faith seeking assistance in vain from a scholastic theologian, and find healing only from Text of Holy Writ; or permit Simony and Avarice

6. Early Protestant Attitude.

to imprison Truth until she is freed by a layman versed in the Bible. The English *Everyman* was Protestantized by having the hero saved by Faith instead of by Good Deeds. The Roman Catholics long lacked, both in the drama and elsewhere, such determined protagonists as their opponents possessed, nor was the situation changed until toward the end of the sixteenth century, when the Jesuits began their dramatic propaganda with the aid of all the refinements of the Barocco style. In Spain, beginning with the middle of the sixteenth century, the Corpus Christi processions assumed the form of moralities rigidly Roman Catholic in spirit, filled with hatred of heresy, and usually exalting the mystery of transubstantiation. In the following century, through the genius of Calderon, they attained their zenith, and by their rich mysticism, allegory, and diction they impressed even the Protestant mind.

7. The Oberammergau Passion Play.

While dramas based on the Bible and on legends of the saints maintained their existence in Roman Catholic lands, and even spread to such countries as Poland and Croatia, they gradually retreated from the cities to the rural districts, where they may still be witnessed. By far the most famous of this type is the passion play of Ober-Ammergau (q.v.), which in its original form, represented by a manuscript of 1662, was a combination of a fifteenth-century Augsburg passion play with a sixteenth-century passion play of the Augsburg meistersinger Sebastian Wild, who drew from the *Cristus redivivus* of the Englishman Nicholas Grimald (1519–62). In 1750 the play was entirely revised, at the request of the villagers of Ober-Ammergau, by a Benedictine friar, Ferdinand Rosner, who introduced scenic effects borrowed from the Jesuit stage as well as arias and choruses modeled on Italian opera. The most striking innovation, however, was the representation of prefiguration of New-Testament events in the Old Testament. This motive, apparently found in the Middle Ages only in the Heidelberg passion play (manuscript of 1513), which, for instance, prefigures Jesus and the woman of Samaria by Eliezer and Rebecca at the well, was a favorite device in the Jesuit drama, whence Rosner incorporated it in the Ober-Ammergau play. In the second half of the eighteenth century the mocking spirit of the Enlightenment caused the governments of Bavaria and Austria to assume an unfavorable position toward the religious drama, and the production of passion plays was forbidden. In 1780, however, after "amendment" by the clergy of Ettal, the Ober-Ammergau play was excepted from the prohibition, and though again forbidden in 1801, it was officially sanctioned after 1811. By 1850 the text had again been revised and the verse of the dialogue had been turned into prose, while it now contained clear traces of the influence of the sentimentalism of the eighteenth century and of the religious poetry of Klopstock. The play as now presented is exceedingly impressive and reverent; each actor is chosen in conformity with his character and is schooled both by tradition and practise; but the stage is no longer that of medieval times. The success of the Ober-Ammergau Passion Play has led to the revival of the religious drama in other parts of southern Germany, as at Brixlegg in the Tyrol and at Höritz in Bohemia.

8. The Christmas Plays.

The Christmas plays, still produced even among Protestants, are less ambitious. As already noted, the late Middle Ages witnessed a tendency to transfer the drama of the birth and childhood of Christ from Christmas to the summer, but the Christmas play proper still survived, though in simpler form. Among the German Christmas plays special interest attaches to one of the fifteenth century in the Hessian dialect, presenting many traits which became traditional in the cycle, such as the humorous character of the aged Joseph and the comic shepherd scenes with their allusions to contemporary peasant life. The scenes of the three kings and Herod are often reminiscent of the *Entpfengnuss und Geburdt Johannis und Christi* of Hans Sachs, and they were often amalgamated with the Christmas play, which was also sometimes combined with the Advent play, in which the Christ-child goes about to see whether the children have been good and industrious. See also POEMS, ANONYMOUS, OF THE ANCIENT CHURCH, 18; ROSWITHA.

(WILHELM CREIZENACH.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Among texts may be noted: *Digby Miracle Plays*, ed. W. Sharpe for Abbotsford Club, Edinburgh, 1835; *Towneley Mysteries*, ed. J. Raine for Surtees Society, Durham, 1836; T. Wright, *Early Mysteries and other Latin Poems of the 12th and 13th Centuries*, London, 1838; *Ludus Coventriæ*, ed. J. O. Halliwell for Shakespeare Society, London, 1841; *The Chester Plays*, ed. T. Wright for Shakespeare Society, 2 vols., London, 1843–47; W. Marriott, *Collection of English Miracle Plays or Mysteries*, London, 1843; Migne, *Dictionnaire de mystères*, Paris, 1854; *Digby Mysteries*, ed. J. F. Furnivall, London, 1882; *Miracles de nostre dame par personnages*, ed. G. Paris and U. Robert, 7 vols., Paris, 1876–80 (cf. H. Schnell, *Untersuchungen über den Verfasser des Miracles . . .*, Marburg, 1885); A. Greban, *Mystère de la passion*, ed. G. Paris and G. Raynaud, Paris, 1878; L. T. Smith, *York Plays*, Oxford, 1885; *Miracles de la bienheureuse Vièrge Marie*, ed. C. Bouchet, Orlèans, 1888; *Mistère de S. Bernard de Merthon*, ed. Lecoy de la Marche, Paris, 1889; *Mistère du Viel Testament*, ed. J. de Rothschild, Paris, 1891; C. Davidson, *Studies in the English Mystery Plays*, New York, 1892; *Mystère de la passion*, ed. J. M. Richard, Paris, 1894; A. W. Pollard, *English Miracle Plays, Moralities, and Interludes*, 4th ed., Oxford and New York, 1904; *Everyman: a morality Play; with an Introduction by A. T. Quiller-Couch*, New York, 1908; W. Meyer, *Fragmenta burana*, Berlin, 1901.

Discussions are: J. L. Klein, *Geschichte des Dramas*, iii. 599–754, iv. 1–242, viii. 218–296, ix. 412–489, xi. 2, pp. 602–654, xii. 293–362, 711–754, xiii. 1–121, 13 vols., Leipsic, 1856–76 (deals with medieval plays in Italy, Spain, and England); W. Hone, *Ancient Mysteries Described, especially the English Lyrical Plays founded on Apocryphal N. T. Story*, London, 1823; F. J. Mone, *Schauspiele des Mittelalters*, 2 vols., Carlsruhe, 1846; E. L. N. Viollet le Duc, *Ancien théâtre françois*, 10 vols., Paris, 1854–57; E. Norris, *Ancient Cornish Drama*, 2 vols., Oxford, 1859; C. E. H. de Coussemaker, *Drames liturgiques de moyen âge*, Rennes, 1860; C. Wilken, *Geschichte der geistlichen Spiele in Deutschland*, Göttingen, 1872; M. Sepet, *Les Prophètes du Christ*, Paris, 1878 (fundamental for this class of play); idem, *Origines catholiques de théâtre moderne*, ib. 1901; idem, *Le Drame religieux au moyen âge*, ib. 1903; K. A. Hase, *Miracle Plays and Sacred Dramas*, London, 1880; W. Blades, *Account of the German Morality Play "Depositio cornuti typographici,"* London, 1885; L. Gautier, *Hist. de la poesie liturgique au moyen âge*, vol. i., Paris, 1886; Petit de Julleville, *Les Mystères*, 2 vols., Paris, 1888 (the main work for France); F. M. Stoddard, *References for Students of Miracle-Plays*

and Mysteries, Berkeley, Cal., 1888; A. d'Ancona, *Origini del teatro italiano*, 2d ed., Turin, 1891; K. Froning, *Das Drama des Mittelalters*, 3 vols., Stuttgart, 1891; L. Bates, *The English Religious Drama*, New York, 1893; W. Creizenach, *Geschichte des neueren Dramas*, 3 vols., Halle, 1893–1903; W. Seelmann, *Die Totentänze des Mittelalters*, Nordlingen, 1893; J. E. Wackernell, *Altdeutsche Passionsspiele aus Tirol*, Graz, 1897; R. Heinzel, *Beschreibung des geistlichen Schauspiels im deutschen Mittelalter*, Leipsic, 1898; A. W. Ward, *Hist. of English Dramatic Literature*, i. 1–157, new ed., 3 vols., London, 1899; E. K. Chambers, *The Mediæval Stage*, 2 vols., Oxford, 1903; E. Lintilhac, *Le Théatre serieux du moyen âge*, Paris, 1904 (indispensable); Worp, *Geschiedenis van het Drama . . in Nederland*, vol. i., Groningen, 1904; H. Auz, *Die lateinischen Magierspiele*, Leipsic, 1905; C. M. Gayley, *Plays of our Forefathers and Some of the Traditions upon which they were founded*, New York, 1907; H. Diemer, *Oberammergau and its Passion Play. A Survey of the History of Oberammergau and its Passion Play from their Origin down to the present Day*, 2d ed., London, 1910; Schaff, v. 1, pp. 869 sqq.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION ASSOCIATION: An organization effected in 1903 aiming so to unite workers in religious and educational fields that the religious shall permeate the educational and the educational shall permeate the religious forces at work in the country. The stimulus came from the late William R. Harper, and the executive offices are in Chicago. The membership is composed of four classes—active, sustaining, life, and corresponding or honorary members, the last class limited to fifty who are not residents of America and pay no dues. Members receive without further charge than the dues the volumes containing the proceedings of the annual conventions, as well as *Religious Education*, the bimonthly of the association. The general officers are a president and sixteen vice-presidents elected yearly, treasurer, recording secretary, and general secretary; the last-named is the active executive, upon whom devolves the oversight of the issue of printed matter and extensive travel in the interests of the association, as well as the arrangements for the general conventions. There is a board of directors consisting of forty-seven members, one representing each state, territory, and province which has twenty-five members in the association; twenty members are chosen at large; this board decides where the meetings of the association are to be held. Annual conventions have been held at Chicago, Philadelphia, Boston, Rochester, and Washington, at each of which about 100 addresses were delivered by leaders in religion and education. More than 200 local conferences have been held under the auspices of the association. The executive board is the corporate body and manages the finances. Besides the bimonthly named above and the *Proceedings*, many pamphlets upon special subjects are issued, as well as bulletins, programs, plans, and the like. Up to 1908 over $65,000 has been expended in behalf of education.

The departments of work are: the council of religious education, universities, and colleges, theological seminaries, churches and pastors, Sunday-schools, secondary schools, elementary schools, fraternal and social service, training of teachers, Christian associations, young people's societies, the home, libraries, the press, foreign mission schools, summer assemblies, and religious art and music—seventeen in all. Each department has an executive committee, consisting of president, a recording and an executive secretary, and from three to seven other members, the executive secretary being the responsible officer. Departments often have special meetings, but the annual assemblies of the departments furnish the most important feature of the great conventions. Departmental action becomes action of the association when approved by the executive board, which publishes special researches and papers prepared by departmental experts. Other departments than the council obtain their membership by special registration of members of the association, who choose their department of work. The council has sixty members, half elected by the executive board and half by its own members. Its functions are to reach and to disseminate sound thinking upon all general subjects relating to education in religion and morality; to initiate, conduct, and guide investigation of important educational questions within the scope of the association. It is thus the brain center of the association, and its meetings are more numerous than those of any other department, and include summer conferences. It has prepared and issued an address to the higher educational institutions upon the necessity of courses for training leaders in religious and educational science, for workers in Sunday-schools, and for teachers and skilled workers in industrial and social reconstruction. It has also arranged for the publication of a bibliography of religious education, with editor and editorial board. The department of Sunday-schools has organized a bureau of information for the compiling of statistics, and a committee of twenty-one experts to formulate a Sunday-school curriculum; it has also begun a bibliography for Sunday-school teachers, and has furnished an exhibit, which is being constantly increased, of Sunday-school literature.

Interest in the work is being manifested in foreign lands, the general secretary having received invitations to organize associations in Japan, India, and Norway, and to speak in several other countries.

RICHARD MORSE HODGE.

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY. See LIBERTY, RELIGIOUS.

RELIGIOUS PEDAGOGY, HARTFORD SCHOOL OF: An institution organized and equipped solely for the purpose of accomplishing in religious education what the high-grade normal school or college does in secular education. Founded by the Rev. David Allen Reed at Springfield, Mass., it was incorporated Jan. 28, 1885, under the name "School for Christian Workers." Its course of study was enlarged in 1892, and again in 1897, when it was given the name "Bible Normal College." In Mar., 1902, it was moved to Hartford, Conn., that it might carry on its work in affiliation with Hartford Theological Seminary. At the same time the requirements for admission and graduation were still further strengthened in anticipation of a more strictly professional type of work. On Apr. 14, 1903, the school was reincorporated under the laws of Connecticut and received its present name, together with authority to confer the bachelor's, master's, and doctor's degree in religious pedagogy.

The school is interdenominational and is open to both men and women. The increasing demand from churches and other religious organizations for thoroughly trained teachers is conclusive evidence that a new profession is rapidly developing within the church. To pioneer this new profession, and to secure and thoroughly equip men and women who are qualified by nature and preliminary training to fill it, is the central design of the school.

The work involves three central ideas: The Bible; the child; and the teacher. It is grouped into three departments of study, namely: studies relating to the Bible; studies relating to man; and studies relating to teaching. These studies are designed to afford an accurate, teaching knowledge of the Bible and cognate subjects; an understanding of the individual and social nature of man, with special reference to the child; and the training of the teacher in the essentials of scientific pedagogy. They are intended to give students a professional equipment for positions as Sunday-school superintendents; normal, field, city, district, and primary superintendents; city, home, and foreign missionaries; pastors' assistants, and superintendents and teachers in reformatory and charitable institutions.

The school is under the direction of a board of eighteen trustees. In number of students it has had a sure and steady growth. The number enrolled in all courses, both regular and special, in 1904 was 54; in 1910, 130. The faculty is constituted as follows: President William Douglas Mackenzie, D.D., of Hartford Theological Seminary, president of the institution and professor of Christian doctrine; Rev. Charles Stoddard Lane, A.M., vice-president and professor of church history; Rev. Edward H. Knight, D.D., dean of the faculty and professor of New-Testament language and literature; George E. Dawson, Ph.D., professor of psychology; Edward P. St. John, Pd.M., professor of pedagogy; Rev. Edward E. Nourse, D.D., professor of Old-Testament language and literature; Miss Orissa M. Baxter, professor of home economics.

The school has no endowment, and meets its annual expenses (in 1910, $13,000) chiefly by gifts from individuals, churches, and Sunday-schools.

EDWARD HOOKER KNIGHT.

RELIGIOUS TRACT SOCIETY. See TRACT SOCIETIES, III., 1.

RELLY, JAMES: Universalist; b. at Jeffreston (70 m. w.n.w. of Cardiff), Pembrokeshire, Wales, about 1722; d. at London Apr. 25, 1778. He attended the Pembroke grammar-school, came under the influence of George Whitefield, probably in the latter's first tour of Wales in 1741, and became one of his preachers. His first station was at Rhyddlangwraig near Narbeth, Pembrokeshire; and in 1747 he made a report of a missionary tour to Bristol, Bath, Gloucestershire, and Birmingham. He broke, however, with Whitefield on doctrinal grounds and is known to have been in controversy with John Wesley in 1756. About the same time he adopted Universalism and occupied meeting-houses in various parts of London until his death. One of his converts in 1770 was John Murray (q.v.), the founder of Universalist churches in America. His chief publications were: *The Tryal of Spirits* (London, 1756); *Union; or a Treatise of the Consanguinity between Christ and His Church* (1759); *The Sadducee Detected* (1754); and *Epistles, or the Great Salvation Contemplated* (1776).

BIBLIOGRAPHY: W. Wilson, *Hist. and Antiquities of Dissenting Churches in London*, i. 358–359, iii. 184, 385, 4 vols., London, 1808–14; L. Tyerman, *Life and Times of John Wesley*, i. 536–537, ii. 240, 400, London, 1870–71; R. Eddy, in *American Church History Series*, x. 348, 392, 473, New York, 1894; *DNB*, xlviii. 7–8.

REMENSNYDER, rem'en-snoi''der, **JUNIUS BENJAMIN:** Lutheran; b. at Staunton, Va., Feb. 24, 1843. He was graduated from Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa. (B.A., 1861), and the Gettysburg Theological Seminary (1865). He served in the 131st Pennsylvania Volunteers in 1862–63, and after his ordination in 1865 held pastorates at St. John's, Lewistown, Pa. (1865–67), St. Luke's, Philadelphia (1867–74), Church of the Ascension, Savannah, Ga. (1874–80), and St. James', New York City, of which he has been the head since 1881. In theology he is conservative and is opposed to rationalism, favoring progressive and constructive, not destructive, criticism; he advocates educational rather than emotional methods in religion and in worship holds to the historic liturgies. He has written *Heavenward: or, The Race for the Crown of Life* (Philadelphia, 1874, new ed., 1908); *Doom Eternal: The Bible and Church Doctrine of Everlasting Punishment* (1880); *The Work and Personality of Luther* (New York, 1882); *Lutheran Literature: Its Distinctive Traits and Excellencies* (1883); *The Six Days of Creation: Lectures on the Mosaic Account of the Creation, Fall, and Deluge* (1886); *The Real Presence* (1890); *The Lutheran Manual* (1892); *The Atonement and Modern Thought* (Philadelphia, 1905); and *Mysticism: Psychology, History., and Relation to Scripture, Church, and Christian Life* (1909).

REMIGIUS, re-mij'î-us, **OF AUXERRE:** Medieval scholar; b. in Burgundy before 850; d. about 908. He entered the Benedictine order at the monastery of St. Germanus at Auxerre, where he studied under the famous Heiricus; was called, about 882, by Archbishop Fulco to Reims to reorganize with Hucbald the two schools located there; and after the archbishop's death (900) taught at Paris the liberal arts and probably theology, counting as one of his scholars Odo of Cluny. Besides his commentary on the work of Marcianus Capella (on book IX., *MPL*, cxxxi. 931 sqq.) on the seven liberal arts, and his glosses on the works of Donatus and Priscianus (the fruit of his teaching of grammar, dialectic, and music, and widely used in the Middle Ages), were his commentaries on Genesis (*MPL*, cxxxi. 51 sqq.), Psalms (pp. 133 sqq.), Canticles (cxvii. 295 sqq.), Minor Prophets (pp. 9 sqq.), Epistles of Paul (pp. 361 sqq.), Revelation (pp. 937 sqq.), Matthew, and Mark; homilies on texts from Matthew (twelve in *MPL*, cxxxi. 865 sqq.); and *De celebratione missæ et ejus significatione* (ib., ci. 1246 sqq., under the name of Alcuin), a treatise on the mass, following the view of Paschasius Radbertus (q.v.).

(R. SCHMID.)

Bibliography: *Hist. littéraire de la France*, vi. 99 sqq.; A. Ebert, *Allgemeine Geschichte der Litteratur des Mittelalters*, iii. 234, Leipsic, 1887; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, xii. 753–760; *NA*, 1901, p. 563.

REMIGIUS OF LYONS: Archbishop of that city; d. there Oct. 28, 875. Nothing is known of him prior to his elevation to the episcopate on Mar. 31, 852. He played a prominent part in French ecclesiastical history. He was Archicapellanus (q.v.) from 855 to 863, which was a position of great influence. He figures among the leading members of several synods, indeed presided over the Synod of Valence in 855. He participated in the predestination controversy which had been precipitated on the church by the unhappy monk Gottschalk (q.v.), whom, like some other leaders, he defended. This brought him up against the still more powerful Hincmar, who, in the Synod of Chiersy held in 853, got the endorsement of his four chapters on predestination. But these the synod of Valence refused to ratify and, on the contrary, passed six canons (Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, iv. 193 sqq.) against Hincmar's position, and they were reaffirmed by the Synod of Langres in 859, which was proof of Remigius' influence. In the national Synod of Savonières which immediately followed Remigius presented these canons to Charles the Bald.

Remigius was an able and faithful prelate. When he came into his rule he found that certain sources of revenue which he thought properly belonged to his diocese had been taken from it. He set about regaining this lost revenue and brilliantly succeeded. For these and other services his grateful people canonized him. Various writings have been attributed to him, but he does not seem to have been a writer and the attributions are probably false.

Bibliography: Bouquet, *Receuil*, viii. 388 sqq.; Ceillier, *Auteurs sacrés*, xii. 614 sqq.; *ASB*, Oct., xii. 878 sqq.; *Hist. littéraire de la France*, v. 449 sqq.

REMIGIUS OF REIMS: Bishop of that city; b. at Laon (87 m. n.e. of Paris) about 437; d. at Reims, probably Jan. 13, 532 or 533. In his twenty-second year he became bishop; and his fame rests upon the record, according to Gregory of Tours, of his converting the Frankish king Clovis to Christianity (baptized, Christmas, 496). With this is connected the legend of the ampulla (see Ampullæ). It had its origin with Hincmar of Reims (q.v.). When Remigius crowned Charles the Bald at Metz (869) the sacred oil was produced and alleged to have been used by Remigius at the consecration of Clovis. This was to validate the right of the king of the West Franks over Lotharingia by establishing a connection, if traditional, with the Merovingians. The vial reappeared at the coronation of Philip II. in 1179 and was broken by a revolutionist in 1793. That Remigius exerted influence over Clovis and his sons may be surmised but can not be substantiated in detail, owing to the legendary character of the records. The letter in which Pope Hormisdas appears to have appointed him vicar of the kingdom of Clovis is proved to be spurious; it is presumed to have been an attempt of Hincmar to base his pretensions for the elevation of Reims to the primacy, following the alleged precedent of Remigius. Four letters of Remigius are all that are preserved of his writings (ed. Gundlach, in *MGH, Epist.*, iii. 112–116). (A. Hauck.)

Bibliography: For review of the literature on Remigius: H. Jodart, *Bibliographie des ouvrages concernant la vie et le culte de S. Remi*, Reims, 1891. For early sources consult: The *Vita*, formerly ascribed to Venantius Fortunatus, in *ASB*, Oct., i. 128–131, with commentary, pp. 59–128; *MPL*, lxxxviii. 527–532; and ed. B. Krusch, in *MGH, Auct. ant.*, iv. 2 (1885), 64–67, with commentary, pp. xxii.–xxiv (the *Vita* gives little information). Other materials of little value are in *ASB*, Oct., i. 167–176; *MPL*, cxxv. 1187–98; and *Analecta Bollandiana*, iv (1885), 337–343. Further sources are: Gregory of Tours, *Historia Francorum*, ii. 27, 31, viii. 21, ix. 14, x. 19; idem, *In gloria confessorum*, lxxix.; and Sidonius Apollinaris, *Epist.*, ix. 7. Consult further: F. Dahn, *Urgeschichte der germanischen und romanischen Völker*, iii. 49–61, Berlin, 1885; J. Dorigny, *Vie de S. Remi*, Châlons, 1714; P. Armand, *Hist. de St. Remi*, Paris, 1846; H. Rückert, *Kulturgeschichte*, vol. i., chaps. xii.–xiv., Leipsic, 1853; P. Heber, *Die vorkarolingischen christlichen Glaubenshelden am Rhein*, Frankfort, 1858; C. von Noorden, *Hinkmar*, pp. 393 sqq., Berlin, 1863; H. Schrörs, *Hinkmar*, pp. 446–454, 508–512, Freiburg, 1884; E. d'Avenay, *Saint Remi de Reims*, Reims, 1896; L. Carlier, *Vie de Saint Remi*, Paris, 1896; A. Handecœur, *Saint Remi, évêque de Reims*, Paris, 1896; *Hist. littéraire de la France*, iii. 66 sqq., 155 sqq., Friedrich, *KD*, vol. ii., § 5; Hauck, *KD*, i. 119–120; *DCB*, iv. 541–542.

REMONSTRANTS.

I. History to 1618.
The Remonstrance (§ 1).
Doctrines (§ 2).
Counter-remonstrance (§ 3).
II. From 1618 to 1632.
III. From 1632 to 1795.
IV. The Period of Independent Existence.

Remonstrants is a name given to the adherents of Jacobus Arminius (q.v.) after his death, from the "Remonstrance" which they drew up in 1610 as an exposition and justification of their views (see below). Their history may be divided into four periods, the first extending to the Synod of Dort, 1618; the second comprising the years of persecution until 1632; the third the time of toleration during the existence of the Republic of the United Netherlands until 1795; the fourth the period of their existence as an independent church community.

I. History to 1618: After the death of Arminius (see i. 296 sqq. of this work) those who shared his conviction drew together more closely. They repudiated the name Arminians, but upheld the principle that the free investigation of the Bible should not be hampered by subscription to symbolical books. They addressed themselves to the States of Holland, urging the convocation of a synod for the reconsideration and examination of the Netherland confession and the Heidelberg Catechism. On the invitation of Oldenbarneveldt, the Dutch liberal statesman and a sympathizer with the Remonstrants, forty-one preachers and the two leaders of the Leyden state college for the education of preachers met in The Hague on Jan. 14, 1610, to state in written form their views concerning all disputed doctrines. The document in the form of a remonstrance was drawn up by Jan Uytenbogaert (q.v.) and after a few changes was endorsed and signed by all and in July presented to Oldenbarneveldt. It treats of the value of formulated confessions of faith, of the effect of the grace of God in opposition to

1. The Remonstrance.

their Calvinistic opponents, and of the power of secular authorities in the affairs of the Church. The Remonstrants did not reject confession and catechism, but did not acknowledge them as permanent and unchangeable canons of faith. They ascribed authority only to the word of God in Holy Scripture and were averse to all formalism. They also maintained that the secular authorities have the right to interfere in theological disputes to preserve peace and prevent schisms in the Church.

2. Doctrines.

Their views concerning the operation of divine grace they expressed in the following five articles ("The Five Articles of Arminianism"), the positive part of the Remonstrance:

ARTICLE I.—That God, by an eternal, unchangeable purpose in Jesus Christ, his Son, before the foundation of the world, hath determined, out of the fallen, sinful race of men, to save in Christ, for Christ's sake, and through Christ, those who, through the grace of the Holy Ghost, shall believe on this his Son Jesus, and shall persevere in this faith and obedience of faith, through this grace, even to the end; and, on the other hand, to leave the incorrigible and unbelieving in sin and under wrath, and to condemn them as alienate from Christ, according to the word of the Gospel in John iii. 36: "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him," and according to other passages of Scripture also.

ART. II.—That, agreeably thereto, Jesus Christ, the Savior of the world, died for all men and for every man, so that he has obtained for them all, by his death on the cross, redemption, and the forgiveness of sins; yet that no one actually enjoys this forgiveness of sins, except the believer, according to the word of the Gospel of John iii. 16: "God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life"; and in the First Epistle of John ii. 2: "And he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world."

ART. III.—That man has not saving grace of himself, nor of the energy of his free-will, inasmuch as he, in the state of apostasy and sin, can of and by himself neither think, will, nor do anything that is truly good (such as having faith eminently is); but that it is needful that he be born again of God in Christ, through his Holy Spirit, and renewed in understanding, inclination, or will, and all his powers, in order that he may rightly understand, think, will, and effect what is truly good, according to the word of Christ, John xv. 5: "Without me ye can do nothing."

ART. IV —That this grace of God is the beginning, continuance, and accomplishment of all good, even to this extent, that the regenerate man himself, without that prevenient or assisting, awakening, following, and co-operative grace, can neither think, will, nor do good, nor withstand any temptations to evil; so that all good deeds or movements that can be conceived must be ascribed to the grace of God in Christ. But, as respects the mode of the operation of this grace, it is not irresistible, inasmuch as it is written concerning many that they have resisted the Holy Ghost, —Acts vii., and elsewhere in many places.

ART. V.—That those who are incorporated into Christ by a true faith, and have thereby become partakers of his life-giving spirit, have thereby full power to strive against Satan, sin, the world, and their own flesh, and to win the victory, it being well understood that it is ever through the assisting grace of the Holy Ghost; and that Jesus Christ assists them through his Spirit in all temptations, extends to them his hand; and if only they are ready for the conflict, and desire his help, and are not inactive, keeps them from falling, so that they, by no craft or power of Satan, can be misled, nor plucked out of Christ's hands, according to the word of Christ, John x. 28: "Neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand." But whether they are capable, through negligence, of forsaking again the first beginnings of their life in Christ, of again returning to this present evil world, of turning away from the holy doctrine which was delivered them, of losing a good conscience, of becoming devoid of grace, that must be more particularly determined out of the Holy Scriptures before we ourselves can teach it with the full persuasion of our minds.

3. Counter-remonstrance.

The Confessionalists presented to the States of Holland a Counter-remonstrance in which the view of the Remonstrants was sharply condemned. The States requested six deputies of both parties to discuss the five articles before them. There participated in this Conference of The Hague (1610), Uytenbogaert and Episcopius on the one side and Festus Hommius and Ruardus Acronius, two preachers, on the other; but the dissenting parties agreed neither here nor at another conference held two years later at Delft. As the dissensions led to disturbances, the States in 1614 passed a resolution of peace in which the discussion of disputed points was forbidden in the pulpit. Owing to the influence of Oldenbarneveldt and of the States, the controversies assumed a political character. Zealous Calvinists separated from the congregations of the Remonstrants and held special church services. The majority in the States of Holland persistently refused to convene a national synod as advocated by the Counter-remonstrants, but matters changed as soon as Prince Maurice publicly avowed the cause of the latter. A national synod was convoked (May 30, 1618) by the States-general at Dort, where the five articles of the Remonstrants were condemned (see DORT, SYNOD OF).

II. From 1618 till 1632: By the decrees of the Synod of Dort, the church services of the Remonstrants were prohibited. Episcopius, with the other Remonstrants summoned before the synod, was deposed, as were more than 200 preachers. Those who were not willing to renounce all further activity as preachers, were banished. They united in 1619 at Antwerp, where the basis for a new church community was laid, under the name Remonstrant Reformed Brotherhood. Uytenbogaert and Episcopius, who had found a refuge in Rouen, and Grevinchoven, formerly a preacher of Rotterdam, now in Holstein, assumed the leadership of the Brotherhood while three exiled preachers secretly returned to their country to care for the congregations left there; for in spite of the unfavorable decree, there was still left a considerable number who would not hear the doctrine of absolute grace preached, and there were not wanting deposed preachers who dared to serve them. In 1621 Episcopius drew up a *Confessio sive declaratio sententiæ pastorum qui Remonstrantes vocantur*, which found a large circulation in its Dutch translation. Its value to-day is only historical. Owing to the lack of preachers, there originated in Warmond a movement in favor of the lay sermon, the adherents of which settled later at Rynsburg and founded the Society of Collegiants (see COLLEGIANTS). On the invitation of Sweden and Denmark some preachers went to Glückstadt, Danzig, and other places, founding congregations, which, however, were only of short duration, except that of Friedrichstadt, under the favor and protection of Duke Frederick of Holstein. The congregations in Holland which had separated from the Reformed Church were harassed and persecuted. The preachers were punished with lifelong imprison-

ment at the castle of Loevestein. The conspiracy of the sons of Oldenbarneveldt against Prince Maurice (1623) gave new impulse to the persecution. It was only after the latter's death (1625) that a better time dawned for the Remonstrants. Prince Frederick Henry was of a milder spirit, so that Episcopius and Uytenbogaert could return from exile. All captives, seven in number, fled in 1631 from the castle of Loevestein, without any serious attempt being made to rearrest them. Churches were built, and the congregations received their own preachers. Thus the Brotherhood was established as the Remonstrant Reformed Church Community.

III. From 1632 till 1795: The Remonstrants were tolerated, but not officially recognized until 1795. They were not allowed to build their churches on the street and had to support their preachers by voluntary gifts. In the beginning there were forty congregations, mostly in South Holland. In North Holland there were only four and as many in Utrecht; others were in Gelderland, Overyssel, and Friesland. The delegates of these congregations met every year alternately at Rotterdam and Amsterdam. At one of the first meetings there was established a church order. Uytenbogaert wrote an *Onderwysinge in de christelycke religie* in strict accordance with the confession. A theological seminary was founded at Amsterdam, with Episcopius at its head, who in 1634 delivered his first lectures; this institution educated many distinguished preachers. Gerard Brandt and his sons Caspar, Johannes, and Gerard the Younger belonged to the best preachers of the country in the seventeenth century. As the Remonstrants were not bound by any confession, schism frequently showed itself among them, while tendencies toward Socinianism and Rationalism were not wanting.

IV. The Period of Independent Existence: When Church and State were separated, after the revolution of 1795, the Brotherhood of the Remonstrants was recognized as an independent church community, and they then made an attempt to unite all Protestants. In Sept., 1796, the convention of the Brotherhood sent a letter to the clergymen of all Protestant churches in which the plan was fully discussed; but the Reformed Church refused cooperation. The chief tenet of the Remonstrants was to confess and preach the Gospel of Christ in freedom and tolerance. Their communities suffered considerably during the French rule, but after the restitution of the earlier conditions their cause began to flourish. Many country congregations died out in the last century; but new congregations originated in cities like Arnheim, Groningen, and Dort, where the adherents of the modern tendency in the Netherland Reformed Church joined the Brotherhood under the pressure of confessionalism. It numbers at present twenty-seven congregations with about 12,500 members, all of the congregations being in a flourishing condition.

(H. C. Rogge†.)

Bibliography: Besides the works by Simon Episcopius, Philippus van Limborch, and Jan Uytenbogaert, and the literature under the articles on them, consult: The life of Coolhaes by H. C. Rogge, 2 vols., Amsterdam, 1856–1858; of Coornhert by F. D. J. Moorrees, Nijmegen, 1887, and by C. Lorentzen, Jena, 1886; G. Brandt, *Historie der Reformatie*, 4 parts, Amsterdam, 1671–1704, Eng. transl., *Hist. of the Reformation . . in . . . the Low Countries*, 4 vols., London, 1720–23; A. a Cattenburgh, *Bibliotheca scriptorum Remonstrantium*, Amsterdam, 1728; J. E. I. Walch, *Religionsstreitigkeiten ausser der lutherischen Kirche*, iii. 540 sqq., 10 vols., Jena, 1733–39; J. Regenborg, *Historie der Remonstranten*, 2 parts, Amsterdam, 1774–76; F. Calder, *Memoirs of Simon Episcopius*, London, 1838; A. des Amorie van der Hoeven, *Het tweede Eeuwfest van het Seminarium der Remonstranten*, Leeuwarden, 1840; J. Tideman, *De Remonstr. Broederschap*, Haarlem, 1847; idem, *De Remonstratie en het Remonstratisme*, ib. 1851; idem, *De catechetische Literatuur der Remonstranten*, Rotterdam, 1852; idem, *De Stichting der Remonstr. Broederschap, 1619–34*, 2 vols., Amsterdam, 1871–72; A. Schweitzer, *Die protestantischen Centraldogmen*, ii. 66 sqq., Zurich, 1856; G. Frank, *Geschichte der protestantischen Theologie*, i. 403 sqq., Leipsic, 1862; W. Cunningham, *Historical Theology*, ii. 371–513, Edinburgh, 1864; *Gedenkschrift van het 250 jarig Bestaen der Remonstr. Broederschap*, Rotterdam, 1869; P. H. Ditchfield, *The Church in the Netherlands*, London, 1893; H. Y. Groenewegen, *De Remonstrantie op haren driehonderdsten gedenkag, 1610–14, Januari 1910*, Leyden, 1910; Schaff, *Creeds*, i. 516 sqq., iii. 550 sqq.; the literature under Dort, Synod of; and Holland.

REMPHAN, rem'fan: The name of a deity mentioned only in Acts vii. 43. The readings of the name in the manuscripts are numerous, including the forms *Rompha, Romphan, Rempha, Rephan, Raiphan,* and *Raphan.* The passage is a free quotation from Amos v. 26, in which the New-Testament (A. V.) "Remphan" (R. V., "Rephan"; Westcott and Hort, *Rompha*) displaces the Old-Testament "Chiun" (Babylonian *Kaawanu,* "Saturn"), here following the Septuagint manuscripts *BAQ,* which read *Raiphan* or *Rephan.* No deity named Remphan or Rephan is known, nor is the form known to occur as a title or name for Saturn. On the ground that the change from the form Chiun to Remphan, etc., occurs in the Septuagint, which was made in Egypt, explanations have been attempted, but have proved unsatisfactory, which take into account supposed Egyptian names or combinations, e.g., a Coptic form meaning "king of heaven" (it seems far to go to seek a Coptic form, and the Egyptian equivalent of this Coptic would bear no resemblance to "Remphan"), or an alleged title of Seb (=Saturn) meaning "youngest of the gods" (which is far-fetched, unusual, and unlikely). The best and generally accepted explanation is that the Septuagint form, which Acts borrows, is a mistake in the reading of the Hebrew for "Chiun," a mistake easily explicable when the form of the letters is taken into account. Geo. W Gilmore.

Bibliography: The commentaries on Amos and Acts; Schrader, *KAT*, p. 409, note 1, 410 note 6; idem, in *TSK*, 1874, pp. 324 sqq.

RENAN, re-nān', **JOSEPH ERNEST:** French orientalist; b. at Tréguier (60 m. n.e. of Brest and 5 m. from English Channel), Brittany, Feb. 27, 1823; d. at Paris Oct. 2, 1892. Having lost his father at the age of five, his early training was received from his mother and his sister Henriette, eleven years older than himself, in the pious atmosphere of his Breton home. In 1838 he went to Paris and studied four years in the petit séminaire of St. Nicholas de Chardonnet, after which he studied philosophy at the grand séminaire of Issy (1842–44) and theology at St. Sulpice (1844–45). Even at Issy the skepticism had been aroused which was later to lead him

to break with the Church, for the arguments of Locke, Leibnitz, Malebranche, Cousin, Jouffroy, and others often seemed to Renan more cogent than the arguments advanced against them. The process of revolt was completed at St. Sulpice largely through the study of oriental philology and the books of German Protestant theology, which led him to a mad enthusiasm for German thought, still further enhanced by the influence of German Protestantism. The crisis came as the time approached for his ordination, and disregarding the grief of his mother and the entreaty of his teacher, he left the seminary on Oct. 6, 1845, firmly convinced that he could remain true to Christ only by separating from the Church. Declining to avail himself of the 1,200 francs saved by Henriette, who, filled with similar doubts, had encouraged her brother in his step, Renan, after a brief engagement at the Jesuit Collège Stanislas, received free board and lodging in return for teaching two hours daily in a small school. This gave him ample time to prepare for the university examination, and in May, 1848, he completed a dissertation on the medieval study of Greek, becoming *agrégé de philosophie* in September of the same year. At the same time he studied Hebrew, Arabic, Syriac, and Sanskrit, and worked in mythology, in the history of religion, and in German theology. By June, 1849, he had written his *L'Avenir de la science* (Paris, 1890; Eng. transl., *The Future of Science*, London, 1891), which was to give his theories of the universe and the plans of his life-work. At the advice of his friends, the book was not then published; and realizing, in the revolution of 1848, the impracticality of its visionary philosophical and political ideals, Renan plunged into history and philology. Gradually, however, he became more and more attracted to Semitic philology, so that in 1857 he was nominated for the professorship of Hebrew at the College de France, though his appointment was not confirmed by the government until Jan. 11, 1862.

Meanwhile Renan had gone to Palestine with his sister Henriette (d. at Byblus, now Jebeil, 20 m. s.w. of Tripoli, in 1860), and there he wrote in the hut of a Maronite on Mt. Lebanon his *Vie de Jésus* (the first volume of his *Origines du christianisme*), which made a sensation both within and without religious circles throughout Europe. A flood of replies from Roman Catholics and Protestants alike gave the book a distinction which it did not merit. Yet as contrasted with D. F Strauss' work of the same title Renan's book marks an advance. The unhistorical method of presenting the origin of Christianity upon the scheme of the Hegelian philosophy is given up. The myth theory of Jesus was changed to a legend theory, and the personality of Christ was sought from the geographical, social, cultural, and religious conditions under which he lived and worked. Amid the locally colored picture of the land and the people of Galilee the figure of Jesus is given a setting; not in accordance with the laws of historic truth, but with the esthetic motives and philosophical preconceptions of the author. With the most unbridled license in the treatment of his sources, of which the Fourth Gospel was the most expedient for his esthetic object, he produced a romance which would have been an admirable tribute to his poetic power had his hero been a character less ethical than Jesus. To him Jesus was a gentle Galilean, the darling of women, and an exquisite preacher of morality, dreaming of no other than the paradise of fraternal fellowship of the children of God upon earth; yet filled with ambition, vanity, sensual love, and undisguised deceit. The first sojourn of Jesus in Galilee was a delightful idyll; for a year, perhaps, God was on earth; a constant charm as of magic proceeded from Jesus. But the Baptist transformed him into a religious revolutionary, a sinister prophet, who assumed the rôle of the Messiah, accommodating the desire for the miraculous of his simple disciples, and perishing in the battle with orthodox Judaism. The great mistake of Jesus with Renan was to forget that the ideal is fundamentally ever a utopia and in conflict with the material for realization loses its purity. Then he who lives for the true, the beautiful, and the good is nearer to God than the man of deeds. The forgetting of this was the tragical in the life of Jesus. The moment Jesus entered the battle with evil and sought to reclaim souls for the kingdom of God, Renan's understanding and sympathy ceased. Was Jesus doubtless possessed of "captivating beauty," Paul, on the other hand, was a Jew of hideous appearance, barbarous in speech, and clumsy in thought. He was the first Protestant, the father of a horrible theology which taught predestined damnation. On the day when Paul wrote his first letter, the decadence of Christianity began. The scientific value of the later volumes of the *Origines du christianisme* was higher, since the pen of Renan was less swayed by personal sympathy or antipathy. The *Vie de Jésus* was a decisive factor in its author's career. After delivering his inaugural address at the Collège de France on Feb. 21, 1862, he was suspended; though the agitation did not rest until, on June 11, 1864, Napoleon authorized his recall. An honorable position in the national library was declined that he might devote himself to his studies, but in 1871 he was restored to his professorship, and in 1879 became a member of the Academy. From 1884 to his death he was administrator of the Collège de France.

The life of Renan was essentially twofold; he was, on the one hand, the serious and accurate scholar, on the other, a wit and a dillettante. Fortunately he always valued his scientific activity more highly than his philosophy, and laid far more stress on such contributions as his *History of the People of Israel* and his labors on the *Corpus inscriptionum Semiticarum* than on his loose and sprightly philosophical writings, the pyrotechnic of which enraptured all Europe. Nevertheless his less worthy activity is that by which he has become best known both to his contemporaries and to posterity. More and more, as his early ideals proved impracticable, Renan lost his intellectual bearings, ending in an abysmal skepticism which clothed itself in jest and frivolity. The universe was to him a bad joke and a merry life was its best commentary: such was the quintessence of his philosophy. Like Voltaire, Renan was willing to be "the god of

fools," and, unfortunately, did not feel himself above the boldest blasphemy. For a skepticism of this type moral standards could no longer exist, and religion and ethics were resolved into mere esthetic sensations. Religion as he represented it—an ineradicable longing of the human soul—was the esthetic and sensationalistic impulse toward the infinite, whether expressed in the renunciations of great ascetics or in the mystical effusions of lovely Magdalens. What is beautiful is good; what pleases is beautiful. Yet with all this mad philosophy, Renan's personal life was irreproachable.

Other works of Renan, which are of linguistic and historical value, some of which have run through repeated editions and been translated into many languages, are as follows: *Histoire générale et système comparé des langues sémitiques* (Paris, 1855); *Études d'histoire religieuse* (1857; Eng. transl., *Studies in Religious History*, London, 1863, another 1893); *De l'origine du langage* (1858); *Le Livre de Job traduit* (1858; Eng. transl., London, 1889); *Essais de morale et de critique* (1859); *Le Cantique des cantiques* (1860; Eng. transl., London, 1864); *L'Averroes et l'averroisme* (1860); *Histoire des origines du christianisme* (8 vols., *La vie de Jésus*, 1863, *Les Apôtres*, 1866, *S. Paul*, 1869, *L'Antechrist*, 1873, *Les Évangiles*, 1877, *L'Église chrétienne*, 1879, *Marc-Aurèle*, 1882, *Index général*, 1883; Eng. transl. of all except the last volume, London, 1864–99, with numerous translations of his "Life of Jesus" of other dates); *Mission de Phénicie* (1865–74); *Observations épigraphiques* (1867); *Nouvelles observations d'épigraphie hebraique* (1867); *La Réforme intellectuelle et morale* (1871); *Dialogues et fragments philosophiques* (1876; Eng. transl., *Philosophic Dialogues*, 1883); *Mélanges d'histoire et de voyages* (1878); *Conférences d'Angleterre* (1880; Eng. transl., *Influences of the Institutions of Rome on Christianity*, 1880); *L'Ecclésiaste* (1882); *Souvenirs d'enfance et de jeunesse* (1883; Eng. transl., *Recollections of my Youth*, 1883); *Nouvelles études d'histoire religieuse* (1884; Eng. transl., *Studies in Religious History*, 1886); *Discours et conférences* (1887); *Histoire du peuple d'Israël* (5 vols., 1887–1893; Eng. transl., *History of the People of Israel*, 1888–1891); *Lettres intimes d'Ernest Renan et d'Henriette Renan* (1896; Eng. transl., *Brother and Sister. A Memoir* [of Henriette, by Ernest] *and the Letters of Ernest and Henriette Renan*, 1896); *Étude sur la politique religieuse du règne de Philippe le Bel* (1899); *Lettres du séminaire, 1838–46* (1901); and *Mélanges religieux et historiques* (1904).

(Eugen Lachenmann.)

Bibliography: The best list of books dealing with Renan or his works is in H. P. Thieme, *Guide bibliographique de la littérature française 1800–1906*, pp. 338–345, Paris, 1907 (indispensable for a complete study); a fairly good list of works is in Baldwin, *Dictionary*, iii. 1, pp. 438–439. His life has been written by: E. Ledrain, Paris, 1892, H. Desportes and F. Bournand, Paris, 1893; S. Pawlicki, Vienna, 1894; F. Espinasse, New York, 1895; Mrs. A. M. F. R. Darmesteter, New York, 1897; E. Platzhoff, Leipsic, 1900; and W. Barry, New York, 1905. Consult further: B. Bauer, *Philo, Strauss und Renan und das Urchristenthum*, Berlin, 1874; P. Bourget, *Ernest Renan*, Paris, 1883; idem, *Essai de psychologie contemporaine*, . *M. Renan*, ib. 1885; F. Tarroux, *Jésus-Dieu et M. Renan philosophe*, Paris, 1887; M. Millioud, *La Religion de M. Renan*, Paris, 1891; Sir M. E. G. Duff, *Ernest Renan: in Memoriam*, New York, 1893; G. Monod, *Les Maîtres de l'histoire, Renan, Taine, Michelet*, Paris, 1894 (crowned by the French Academy); G. Séailles, *Ernest Renan. Essai de biographie psychologique*, Paris, 1894; R. Allier, *La Philosophie d'Ernest Renan*, Paris, 1895; G. Paris, *Penseurs et poètes*, Paris, 1896; J. Simon, *Quatre portraits: Lamartine, Lavigerie, E. Renan, Guillaume II.*, Paris, 1896; E. Renan and M. Berthelot, *Correspondance, 1847–1892*, ib. 1898; C. Denis, *La Critique irréligieuse de Renan*, ib. 1898; H. G. A. Brauer, *The Philosophy of Ernest Renan*, University of Wisconsin, 1904; G. Sorel, *Le Système historique de Renan*, Paris, 1906; Vigouroux, *Dictionnaire*, fasc. xxxiv. 1041–43.

RENATA OF FERRARA. See Renée of France.

RENATO, rê-nā'tō, CAMILLO: Italian antitrinitarian and Anabaptist; b. in Sicily early in the sixteenth century; d. after 1570. As a fugitive he came in 1542 to the Valtellina, where he was employed as a private tutor in various families. At Chiavenna, in 1545, he became involved in violent dogmatic controversies with the Zwinglian preacher, Agostino Mainardo, since, recognizing baptism as efficacious only in so far as it is an act of profession of faith, he declared it to be inadmissible in the case of children. He also maintained other doctrines attributed to the Anabaptists, such as that the soul dies with the body, and that at the last day the regenerate alone share in the resurrection, their bodies being completely spiritualized, while regeneration itself arises reflexively and immediately from the kindling of the divine spirit in man. He won a number of adherents, but in 1547 the Council of Chur interfered and summoned both Mainardo and Renato to appear for hearing. The latter ignored the summons, although in the following year he subscribed an act of agreement. Since, however, he continued his sectarian teachings, he was excommunicated by a synod in 1550. A new doctrinal regulation was then expected to put an end to all Anabaptist activity, but despite the system adoptcd by the Swiss Federation in 1553, some traces of Renato's influence long persisted, especially in view of his close friendship with Laelius Socinus after 1547, and particularly after 1552. The execution of Servetus led Renato to inveigh against Calvin in a Latin poem (ed. Trechsel, *Antitrinitarier*, i. 492). Since such pupils of Renato as Fiori in Soglio and Turriano in Plurs continued religious agitations and attracted Italian refugees who had been received into the churches, the doctrinal regulations of 1553 were reenforced in 1561, all who refused to subscribe being excommunicated. Mainardo died in 1563; Renato, who became blind, was still living at Caspano in the early part of the eighth decade of the sixteenth century.

K. Benrath.

Bibliography: P. D. R. de Porta, *Historia Reformationis ecclesiæ Rhæticæ*, vol. i., Leipsic, 1771; F. Trechsel, *Die protestantischen Antitrinitarier vor Faustus Socin*, vol. i., Heidelberg, 1839; *Bullingers Korrespondenz mit den Graubündnern*, vol. i., ed. Schiess in *Quellen zur Schweitzer Geschichte*, vol. xxiii., Basel, 1904.

RENAUDOT, re-nau'dō, EUSÈBE: French Roman Catholic; b. at Paris July 20, 1646; d. there Sept. 1, 1720. He was educated by the Jesuits, and for a month was an Oratorian, after which he became a secular priest. In 1700 he accompanied Cardinal Noailles to the conclave at Rome, and on his return began a series of works on the history of the East and the harmony of the Greek and Roman churches as regards the Eucharist. These comprise: *Défense de la perpétuité de la foi catholique* (Paris, 1708); *La Perpétuité de la foi de l'église catholique touchant l'eucharistie* (1711); *De la perpétuité de la foi de l'église sur les sacrements et autres points que les réformateurs ont pris pour prétexte de leur schisme* (2 vols., 1713); *Gennadii patriarchæ Constantinopolitani homiliæ de eucharistia, Meletii Alexandrini, Nectarii Hierosolymitani, Miletii Syrigi et aliorum* (1709); *Historia patriarcharum Alexandrinorum Jacobitarum a Sancto Marco usque ad*

finem sæculi tertii decimi (1713); and *Liturgiarum orientalium collectio* (2 vols., 1715–16; Eng. transl., *A Collection of the Principal Liturgies*, P. Le Brun, Dublin, 1822). Mention should also be made of his *Anciennes relations des Indes et de la Chine de deux voyageurs mahométans* (Paris, 1718; Eng. transl., *Ancient Accounts of India and China*, London, 1733.)

(C. PFENDER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Niceron, *Mémoires*, xii. 25 sqq., xx.; Bore, *Hist. de l'académie des inscriptions*, vol. v., *Journal des savants*, 1689, Paris, 1709; *KL*, x. 1054–55; Lichtenberger, *ESR*, xi. 210–211.

RENDALL, GERALD HENRY: Church of England; b. at Harrow (10 m. n.w. of London) Jan. 25, 1851. He was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge (B.A., 1874; fellow, 1875; M.A., 1877; B.D., 1909), where he was fellow and assistant tutor until 1880; was made deacon, 1898, and priest, 1899; was lecturer and assistant tutor at Trinity College, Cambridge (1875–80); was principal and Gladstone professor of Greek at University College, Liverpool (1881–98); vice-chancellor of Victoria University (1890–94); a member of the Gresham University Committee (1892–93); and Lady Margaret preacher at Cambridge, 1901. Since 1898 he has been head master of the Charterhouse School. In theology he is a liberal Anglican. He prepared an edition, translation, and commentary of the Epistle of Barnabas for W Cunningham's *Dissertation on the Epistle of Saint Barnabas* (2 parts, London, 1877) and the life of Pliny for J. E. B. Mayor's edition of the third book of the *Epistolæ* (1880), besides translating the "Meditations" of Marcus Aurelius (1898); and has written *The Emperor Julian, Paganism, and Christianity* (Cambridge, 1879); *The Cradle of the Aryans* (London, 1889); and *The Epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians: a Study personal and historical of the Date and Composition of the Epistles* (1909).

RENDTORFF, FRANZ: German Protestant; b. at Gütergotz (a village near Potsdam) Aug. 1, 1860. He was educated at the universities of Kiel, Erlangen, and Leipsic from 1879 to 1883. He was *Domkandidat* at Berlin in 1883–84; pastor at Westerland-Sylt (1884–88); preacher at the theological seminary at Eisenach (1888–91), monastery preacher at Preetz (1891–96), and director of studies at the preachers' seminary in the same city (1896–1902); privat-docent for practical theology in the University of Kiel (1902–08); professor of the same (1908–1910); removed to Leipsic in the same capacity in 1910. He has written *Die schleswig-holsteinischen Schulordnungen vom sechzehnten bis zum Anfang des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts* (Kiel, 1902) and *Die Taufe im Urchristentum im Lichte der neueren Forschungen* (Leipsic, 1905).

RENÉE, re-nê', **OF FRANCE (RENATA OF FERRARA):** French Protestant, daughter of King Louis XII. of France and wife of Ercole II., duke of Ferrara; b. at Blois (100 m. s.w. of Paris) Oct. 25, 1510; d. at Montargis (38 m. e. of Orléans) June 12, 1575. Having been early orphaned, she was brought up by the devout Madame de Soubise. She was married in Apr., 1528, and received from Francis I. an ample dowry and annuity. Thus the court that she assembled about her in Ferrara corresponded to the tradition which the cultivation of science and art implicitly required, including scholars like Bernardo Tasso and Fulvio Pellegrini. Her first child, Anna, born in 1531, was followed by Alfonso, in 1533; Lucrezia, 1535; after these, Eleonora and Luigi; whose education she carefully directed. In 1534 the old duke died, and Ercole succeeded to the throne. Hardly had he rendered his oath of allegiance to the pope when he turned against the French at his own court. Both their number and influence displeased him; and, besides, he found them too expensive; so he by direct or indirect means secured their dismissal, including the poet Clément Marot. And while the Curia was urging the duke to put away the French that were suspected of heresy, there came to Ferrara no less a heretic than John Calvin, whose journey to Italy must have fallen in Mar. and Apr., 1536. Calvin passed several weeks at the court of Renée, though the persecution had already begun, and about the same time a chorister by the name of Jehannet, also one Cornillan, of the attendants of the duchess, together with a cleric of Tournay, Bouchefort, were taken prisoners and tried. In a "man of small stature," whom the Inquisition likewise seized as under suspicion, although he made his escape, is to be recognized not Calvin, but Clément Marot.

McCrie, Bonnet, and others have asserted that Renée's attitude toward the Reformation in Italy was favorable. Fontana, reinforced by much new material, has strongly combatted this view, although he must admit that the visit of Calvin speaks against his contention. Cornelius also combats the inference drawn from Calvin's visit. But both Fontana and Cornelius were unacquainted with the decisive documents brought to light by Paolo Zendrini in 1900. These show that Renée was not only in correspondence with a very large number of Protestants abroad, with intellectual sympathizers like Vergerio, Camillo Renato, Giulio di Milano, and Francisco Dryander, but also that on two or three occasions, about 1550 or later, she partook of the Lord's Supper in the Evangelical manner together with her daughters and fellow believers. Meanwhile, notwithstanding its external splendor, her life had grown sad. The last of her French guests, the daughter and son-in-law of Madame de Soubise of Pons, had been obliged, in 1543, by the constraint imposed by the duke, to leave the court. The drift of the Counter-Reformation, which had been operative in Rome since 1542, led to the introduction of a special court of the Inquisition at Ferrara, in 1545, through which, in 1550 and 1551, death sentences were decreed against Evangelical sympathizers (Fannio of Faenza and Giorgio of Sicily), and executed by the secular arm. Finally Duke Ercole lodged accusation against Renée before King Henry II. of France, and through the Inquisitor Oriz, whom the king charged with this errand, Renée was arrested as a heretic, and declared forfeit of all possessions unless she recanted. She thereupon yielded, made confession on Sept. 23, 1554, and once again received communion at mass. "How seldom is there an example of steadfastness among aristocrats," wrote Calvin to Farel under date of Feb. 2, 1555.

Renée's longing to return home was not satisfied until a year following the death of her husband on Oct. 3, 1559. In France she found her eldest daughter's husband, François de Guise, at the head of the Roman Catholic party. His power, indeed, was broken by the death of Francis II., in Dec., 1560, so that Renée became enabled not only to provide Evangelical worship at her estate, Morntargis, engaging a capable preacher by application to Calvin, but also generally to minister as benefactress of the surrounding Evangelicals. In fact, she made her castle a refuge for them, when her son-in-law once again lighted the torch of war. This time her conduct won Calvin's praise (May 10, 1563), and she is one of the frequently recurring figures in his correspondence of that period; he repeatedly shows recognition of her intervention in behalf of the Evangelical cause; and one of his last writings in the French tongue, despatched from his deathbed (Apr. 4, 1564), is addressed to her. While Renée continued unmolested in the second religious war (1567), in the third (1568–70) her castle was no longer respected as an asylum for her fellow believers. On the other hand, she succeeded in rescuing a number of them from the massacre of St. Bartholomew's night, when she happened to be in Paris. They left her personally undisturbed at that time; though Catherine de'Medici still sought to move her to retract. But she died in the Evangelical faith. In consonance with Renée's last fifteen years, her will (given by Bonet-Maury in the *Revue historique*, 1894) bears witness of her Evangelical goodness.

K. Benrath.

Bibliography: J. Bonnet long collected materials for a biography which he put into form in *Bulletin de la société de l'hist. du protestant français*, 1866, 1869, 1877–81; very rich sources are tapped in B. Fontana, *Renata di Francia*, 3 vols., Rome, 1889–99, and in the same author's *Documenti Vaticani*, ib. 1892 (in *Archivio della Soc. Romana di Storia patria*); the material accumulated by Bonnet (ut sup.) was worked over by E. Rodocanacchi, *Une protectrice de la reformée en Italie et en France*, Paris, 1896; G. Bonet-Maury, *Besprechung von Fontana*, in *Revue historique*, 1894. Biographies were written also by J. P. G. Catteau-Colleville, Berlin, 1781; E. J. H. Münch, Aachen, 1831; I. M. B., London, 1859; anonymous, Gotha, 1869; F. Blümmer, Frankfort, 1870; S. W. Weitzel, New York, 1883; and literature under Morata, Olimpia. Consult also: A. F. Girardot, *Procès de Renée de France . . contre Charles IX.*, Nancy, 1858 (?); L. Jarry, *Mai, 1562. Renée de France a Montargis. Episode des guerres religeuses*, Orléans, 1868. There are letters to her from Calvin, dated Oct., 1541, Aug. 6, 1554, May 10, 1563, in the Eng. transl. of Bonnet's ed. of Calvin, i. 295–306, iii. 50–52, iv. 313–316; and a letter from her to Bullinger, dated Oct. 24, 1542, in A. L. Herminjard, *Correspondance des réformateurs*, viii. 161–163, Paris, 1893.

RENEWAL: The terms "renew," "renewing" occur in the English New Testament only in the epistles (Paul and Hebrews) where they give expression to a wide conception which embraces the entire subjective side of salvation. This they represent as a work of God issuing in a wholly new creation (II Cor. v. 17; Gal. vi. 15; Eph. ii. 10). The absence of these terms from the Gospels does not argue the absence of the thing expressed by them. In point of fact it is taught throughout Scripture that man has by his sin not merely incurred the Divine condemnation but also corrupted his own heart, and needs therefore for his recovery not merely, objectively, pardon, but, subjectively, purification; neither of which can he have except by a work of God. In the Old Testament the sin of our first parents is represented as no more inculpating than corrupting, and all that are born of woman are declared to be corrupt from the womb (Job xv. 14–16; Ps. li. 5). It is God alone who can "turn" a man "a new heart" (I Sam. x. 9; Ps. li. 10) and the saints rest on the divine promise that he will do so (Deut. xxx. 6; Jer. xxxi. 33; Ezek. xxxvi. 26). Jesus began his ministry as the dispenser of the Spirit, and his distinction lay precisely in the fact that his baptism with the Spirit works the inner purification which the baptism of John only symbolized. Accordingly he teaches expressly that the kingdom of God is not for the children of the flesh but the children of the Spirit (John iii. 3), and everywhere he presupposes that the corrupt tree of human nature must be first cleansed before good fruit can be expected of it (Matt. vii. 17). The broad treatment of such a theme characteristic of the Gospels gives way measurably in the epistles, where discriminations of aspects and stages begin to show themselves. The stress continues to be laid, however, on the main points, that man is dead in sin and is vitalized to righteousness only by a creative work of the Holy Spirit in his heart.

The church has retained, on the whole, with considerable constancy the essential elements of this Biblical teaching. In all types of historical Christianity the teaching is persistent that salvation consists in its substance of a radical subjective change wrought by the Holy Spirit. By virtue of this change, the tendencies to evil native to man as fallen are progressively eradicated and holy dispositions are implanted, nourished, and perfected. The most direct contradiction which this teaching has received in the history of Christian thought was that given it by Pelagius at the opening of the fifth century. Asserting the inalienable ability of the will to do all righteousness, Pelagius necessarily denied that man had been subjectively injured by sin or needed subjective divine operations for his perfecting. The vigorous reassertion by Augustine of the necessity of subjective grace for the doing of good put pure Pelagianism once for all outside the pale of recognized Christian teaching. In more or less modified forms, however, it has persisted as a wide-spread tendency conditioning the purity of the supernaturalism of salvation which is confessed.

The strong emphasis laid by the Reformers on the fundamental doctrine of justification threw the objective side of salvation into such prominence that its subjective side, which was not in dispute between them and their most immediate opponents, seemed to pass temporarily out of sight. Occasion was taken, if not given, to represent it as neglected if not denied. In the first generation of the Reformation movement, men of mystical tendency like Osiander reproached the Protestant teaching as if it recognized only an external salvation. The reproach was eminently unjust. With all the emphasis which Protestant theology lays on justification by faith as the central fact of salvation, it has never failed to lay equal stress on regeneration as its root and sanctification as its crown. Least of all

can the Reformed theology with its insistence upon "total depravity" and "irresistible grace" be justly accused of failure to give its rights to the great fact of supernatural "renewal." In its view justifying faith is itself the gift of God, operating subjectively upon the soul, and as justification thus issues out of a subjective effect wrought in the soul by God, so it issues into a subjective effect, the sanctification of the soul through the indwelling Spirit.

The debate at this point of the Protestant system with that of Rome does not concern the necessity or the reality of the cleansing of the soul from sinful tendencies and dispositions, but the relation of this cleansing operation to the reception of the sinner into the divine favor. Protestant theology insists that God does not wait until we deserve his favor before he is gracious to us; it feels that if that were so, our doom were sealed. In its view God first receives us into his favor and then makes us worthy of it. This is commonly given expression in the formula that justification underlies sanctification, and sanctification is a consequence of a precedent justification. But Protestant theology has never imagined that the sinner could get along with justification alone. It has rejoiced in the provision of the Gospel for relieving the soul of its intolerable weight of guilt and condemnation. But it has rejoiced equally in the provision made for relieving the soul of its intolerable burden of corruption and pollution. If it has refused to think of salvation as grounded in our holiness, it has equally refused to think of it as issuing in anything else but holiness. However far off the perfecting of this holiness may seem to be removed, it has never been willing to discover the substance of salvation in anything other than a perfected holiness.

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

RENOUF, PETER LE PAGE: Roman Catholic Egyptologist; b. on the isle of Guernsey Aug. 23, 1822; d. at London Oct. 15, 1897. He was educated at Pembroke College, Oxford; entered the Church of Rome, 1842; became professor of ancient history and Eastern languages on the opening of the Roman Catholic University of Ireland, 1855; royal inspector of schools, 1866; and was keeper of oriental antiquities in the British Museum, 1886–92. In 1887 he became president of the Society of Biblical Archeology. He was the author of *The Condemnation of Pope Honorius* (London, 1868); *The Case of Honorius Reconsidered with Reference to Recent Apologies* (1869); *An Elementary Grammar of the Ancient Egyptian Language* (1875; 2d ed., 1890); and *Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion as Illustrated by the Religion of Ancient Egypt* (Hibbert Lectures for 1879; 1880).

BIBLIOGRAPHY. For biography of Renouf consult vol. iv., 1st series, of *The Life-Work of Peter Le Page Renouf*, ed. G. Maspero, W. H. Rylands, and E. Naville, Paris, 1902–1907.

RENUNCIATION OF THE DEVIL IN THE BAPTISMAL RITE: A ceremony which, according to ancient usage, in many rituals precedes the application of water in baptism. In the Book of Common Prayer of the Anglican communion, the offices for the public and private baptism of infants and of those of riper years contain the question: "Dost thou renounce the devil and all his works, the vain pomp and glory of the world ?" The question is addressed to the sponsors in the offices for infant baptism and to the candidates in the office for those of riper years. Similarly in the Anglican Catechisms of 1549 and 1662 in reply to the third question: "What did your godfathers and godmothers then (i.e., in baptism) for you?" the answer is: "They did promise and vow that I should renounce the devil and all his works, the pomps and vanity of this wicked world, and all the sinful lusts of the flesh," and this is retained in the catechism in current use. This renunciation has a long ancestry and a wide application, a very few rather notable exceptions alone prohibiting assertion of the universality of its use in the Christian Church in all its branches since the second century. Indeed, attempts were made very early to trace in the New Testament evidences of the use of this renunciation to the Apostolic Church. These attempts were based partly upon I Tim. vi. 12: "thou hast professed a good profession before many witnesses." Examples of this are given in the commentary on the passage in the works of Jerome and Ambrose, attributed to Hilary the Deacon and Pelagius, the words being explained: "Thou hast confessed a good confession in baptism, by renouncing the world and its pomps, before many witnesses" ("world and its pomps" being regarded as equivalent to "the devil and his pomps" found in many of the formulas; see below). A second alleged testimony to the Apostolic use of this formula is found in I Pet. iii. 21: "The answer of a good conscience toward God," which is interpreted as recalling the question and answer in the prebaptismal service. Tertullian derives the practise "if not from Scripture" yet from custom supported by enduring tradition (*De corona*, iii., given in *ANF*, iii. 94), and Basil derives it directly from the apostles ("On the Holy Spirit," xxvii.; Eng. transl. in *NPNF*, 2 ser., viii. 42, and by G. Lewis, in *Christian Classics Series*, vol. iv., London, 1888). While this assertion of Apostolic origin can not be sustained by cogent proof, the evidence is clear that in the second century formal renunciation of the devil was customary immediately preceding baptism.

The first explicit testimony to the use of a definite formula comes from Tertullian (*De corona*, iii.), where he says: "When we are going to enter the water, but a little before, in the presence of the congregation and under the hand of the president, we solemnly profess that we disown the devil, and his pomp, and his angels"; and in *De spectaculis*, iv (*ANF*, iii. 81), he employs almost the same words, and proceeds to explain them with reference to the temptations current at the time. In third-century usage, as shown by the Canons of Hippolytus (canon xix.), the catechumen turned to the West (symbolically the region of darkness) and repeated: "I renounce thee, Satan, with all thy pomp." Cyril of Jerusalem ("Catechetical Lecture," xix. 2–9; Eng. transl. in *NPNF*, 2 ser., vii. 144–146) lengthens the formula to: "I renounce thee, Satan, and all thy works, and all thy pomp, and all thy service," the candidate facing the West and stretching out his

arm. Cyril adds a running commentary, in which the significance of the act in its several parts is given with reference to the life of the times.

The establishment of the formula is proved by its entrance into the church orders of the fourth century, sometimes varied slightly, as in the form: "I renounce thee, Satan, and all thy service and all thy (unclean) works." The "Testament of the Lord" (ii. 8) makes the candidate turn to the West and recite: "I renounce thee, Satan, and all thy (military) service (literally, "wills"), and thy shows (literally, "theaters"), and thy pleasures, and all thy works" (*Testament of our Lord*, ed. J. Cooper and A. J. Maclean, p. 126, cf. 213, Edinburgh, 1902). The Apostolic Constitutions (vii. 41) has a longer formula: "I renounce Satan, and his works, and his pomps, and his worships, and his angels, and his inventions, and all things that are under him" (*ANF*, vii. 476). While it is abundantly evident that the foregoing is primarily the utterance of adults in their own persons, it is also clear that sponsors took upon them these vows in behalf of children (Tertullian, *De baptismate*, xviii., *ANF*, iii. 678—Tertullian is arguing in this place against the admission of children to baptism; "Canons of Hippolytus," "Testament of our Lord," ii. 8). The form in use at Rome at least as early as the eighth century consisted of a triple question and answer: "Dost thou renounce Satan? I renounce (him). And all his works? I renounce (them). And all his pomps? I renounce (them)." In the original English form there were also three questions and answers: "Dost thou forsake the devil and all his works? I forsake them all. Dost thou forsake the vain pomp desires of the same? I forsake them all. Dost thou forsake the carnal desires nor be led by them? I forsake them." (J. H. Blunt, *Annotated Book of Common Prayer*, p. 413, New York, 1908).

This usage is confirmed by the *Missale Gallicanum* and the missal of Sarum, and the formula occurs in the office of the Orthodox Eastern Church for making a catechumen. The Armenian form is: "We renounce thee, Satan, and all thy deceitfulness, and thy wiles, and thy service, and thy paths, and thy angels." Practical uniformity is preserved also in the Jacobite, Coptic, and Ethiopic rites (cf. Denzinger's work, in bibliography).

Bingham (*Origines*, XI., vii. 4–5) calls special attention to these facts: (1) the baptisteries contained two rooms, and it was in the anteroom that the renunciation was made; (2) the direction in which the catechumen faced was (invariably) the West; (3) the renunciation was emphasized by gesture and act—by extension of the hands (probably with a triple gesture of repulsion), by striking of the hands together (thrice), even by (triple) exsufflation or spitting (Gregory Nazianzen, *Oratio*, xl., *De baptismate;* Dionysius, *De hierarchia ecclesiastica*, ii. 3). GEO. W. GILMORE.

From the medieval baptismal rite renunciation came into Luther's *Taufbüchlein*, and thence into the Lutheran ritual of baptism. The validity of baptism, however, was not made dependent on the renunciation; it is missing in some sixteenth-century forms, as the Württemberg *Kirchenordnung* of 1536. It was wanting in Zwingli's form for baptism, from which all additions, not founded on the Scriptures, are omitted, and in the Geneva ordinances, but is retained in the English baptismal liturgy. Since the rise of rationalism an effort has been made among Lutherans to abolish the renunciation because of the denial of the devil's existence, the offense which the cultured took at the practise, and the fear of promoting superstition. Furthermore, it has been regarded as a species of Exorcism (q.v.). Toward the end of the eighteenth century clergymen began to relax in their strict observance of church ordinances, and the renunciation disappeared in many congregations of Germany, but was more generally retained in the country. Many of the modern liturgies either omit it altogether or retain it in modified form. W CASPARI.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: Cyril of Jerusalem, "Catechetical Lectures to the Newly Baptized," first lecture, Eng. transl. in *NPNF*, 2 ser., vii. 144–146; Apostolic Constitutions, vii. 41, Eng. transl. in *ANF*, vii. 476; S. Basil, *De Spiritu Sancto*, xxvii., Eng. transl. in *NPNF*, 2 ser., viii. 42; Bingham, *Origines*, XI., vii. 1–5; J. Vicecomes, *Observationes ecclesiasticæ in quo de antiquis baptismi ritibus agitur*, II., xx., Paris, 1618; W Cave, *Primitive Christianity*, I., x., London, 1672, Oxford, 1840; J. S. Assemani, *Codex liturgicus ecclesiæ universæ*, i. 174, ii. 211, Rome, 1749–66; W. Maskell, *Monumenta ritualia ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*, i. 22–23, 3 vols., London, 1846–47; J. M. Neale, *Hist. of the Eastern Church*, ii. 945, 5 vols., ib. 1850–73; R. F. Littledale, *Offices from the Service Books of the Eastern Church*, p. 134, ib. 1863; H. J. D. Denzinger, *Ritus Orientalium*, i. 198, 223, 234, 273, 279, 304, 321, 340, 354, 385, 2 vols., Würzburg, 1863–64; F. E. Warren, *Liturgy and Ritual of the Ante-Nicene Church*, London, 1897; L. Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, pp. 304–334, ib. 1904; *Rituale Armenorum*, ed. F. C. Conybeare, Oxford, 1905; J. H. Blunt, *The Annotated Book of Common Prayer*, pp. 412–413, New York, 1908.

RENZ, rents, FRANZ: Roman Catholic; b. at Altenstadt (38 m. s.w. of Augsburg) Oct. 3, 1860. He received his education at the gymnasium and high school at Dillingen and at the University of Munich; was ordained priest in 1884 and served as city chaplain at Nördlingen, 1884–85; was prefect at the boys' seminary at Dillingen, 1885–91; subregent at the theological seminary at Dillingen, 1891–97; director of the boys' seminary there, 1899–1901; regent of the theological seminary at the same place, 1901–03; went to Münster as professor of dogmatic theology, 1903; and to Breslau in the same capacity, 1907 He is the author of *Opfercharakter der Eucharistie nach der Lehre der Väter und Kirchenschriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte* (Paderborn, 1892); and *Die Geschichte des Messopfer-Begriffs, oder die alte Glaube und die neuen Theorien über das Wesen des unblutigen Opfers* (2 vols., Freising, 1901–02).

REORGANIZED CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER DAY SAINTS. See MORMONS, III.

REPENTANCE: Ethically repentance is the feeling of pain experienced by man when he becomes conscious that he has done wrongly or improperly in thought, word, or deed. It always presupposes knowledge of fault, and is usually combined with judgment. It is a natural and involuntary feeling of pain, and is not the result of education, habit, or reflection, nor is it essentially a religious or moral duty. It is manifested in many

ways, but must not be confused with the permanent state of mind termed penitence. In dogmatic phraseology repentance is " godly sorrow " (II Cor. vii. 10) and the pain caused by having wronged God through sin (Ps. li. 4). This contrition is carefully distinguished from attrition, which fears only the punishment and the evil consequences of sin. Repentance, moreover, even though necessarily renewed daily by the Christian, is only a process through which sorrow must be put away by an act of will wherein the Christian casts sin from him and surrenders himself to the grace of God. Where this act of will is not performed, repentance is fruitless, and therefore painful. There is no ground for asserting, on the other hand, that a certain amount of penitential pain is necessary to obtain forgiveness, and still less can stress be laid on outward signs of repentance.

The term repentance is also applied to the displeasure felt when good intentions turn out to be ineffectual, and when toil and trouble are taken in vain. Here one can scarcely fail to feel that in some way he has discerned his ill success, but where one really believes himself to be in the right, he should repent of no exertions undertaken in a good cause, nor should he be discouraged or disheartened from the pursuit of right aims. In the latter sense the Bible occasionally speaks of the repentance of God, as in the creation of man (Gen. vi. 6) and in making Saul king of Israel (I Sam. xv. 11, 35), as well as in cases where he refrained from inflicting punishment as he had intended (Ex. xxxii. 14; Ps. cvi. 45; Jer. xviii. 8, 10, xxvi. 3, 19, xlii. 10; Joel ii. 13–14; Amos vii. 3, 6; Jonah iii. 9–10). On the other hand, such passages as Num. xxiii. 19; I Sam. xv. 29; Ps. cx. 4; Jer. iv. 28; Ezek. xxiv. 14; and Rom. xi. 29 show in what sense repentance is excluded from the nature of God. See Penance.

(Karl Burger†.)

Bibliography: The subject is, naturally, a frequent subject of pulpit discourse, and classic examples are: G. Whitefield, *Works*, vi. 3 sqq., London, 1771; J. Saurin, *Sermons*, Eng. transl. by R. Robinson, iii. 245 sqq., ib. 1812; T. Scott, *Discourse upon Repentance*, Works, i. 125 sqq., ib. 1823; S. Davies, *Sermons on Important Subjects*, iii. 462 sqq., New York, 1851. Consult also: J. Arndt, *True Christianity; a Treatise on sincere Repentance, true Faith*, etc., Philadelphia, 1868. It is usually treated in the works on dogmatic theology, e.g., W. G. T. Shedd, *Dogmatic Theology*, ii. 534 sqq., New York, 1889.

REPHAIM. See Canaan, Canaanites, § 5; Giants in the Old Testament.

REPINGTON (REPYNGDON), PHILIP: Bishop of Lincoln, cardinal, and formerly a follower of Wyclif; d. some time before Aug. 1, 1424. He was possibly a native of Wales though coming of English ancestry; he received his education at Broadgates Hall, Oxford, where in early manhood he preached in accordance with Wyclif's doctrine on the sacrament of the altar, becoming the Reformer's most prominent advocate at Oxford. In 1382 he especially offended by a sermon at St. Frideswide's, and the report goes that a result was insurrection on the part of the people. This was on June 2, and by July 1 he was condemned and excommunicated at Canterbury, and there was coupled with this a prohibition to harbor him at Oxford. He soon recanted, and was restored to his position by the archbishop of Canterbury Oct. 23, and made public abjuration of his " heresies " at Oxford, Nov. 18. In 1394 he became abbot of St. Mary de Pré, and in this capacity probably he became intimate with Henry IV., whose favor he won, becoming royal chaplain. In 1404 he became bishop of Lincoln, and in 1407 he was charged, and probably correctly, with persecuting the Lollards. He was made cardinal with the title of Sts. Nereus and Achilleis by Gregory XII. (q.v.), though the deposition of this pope and annulment of his acts after May, 1408, left Repington's status under a cloud. Whether he acted as cardinal is not clear, and in 1410 he was back in England and active officially. Notices of him after this period are scanty, and usually show him as an active member of the hierarchy. Apart from this, his reputation is that of " a God-fearing man, a lover of truth and hater of avarice " (Wood, *Fasti*, p. 35, see bibliography). He did not carry into effect the decree of the Council of Constance ordering the exhumation of Wyclif's remains, although this was done. He left in manuscript a number of sermons, which are extant in several of the libraries at Oxford, and other writings are with less assurance thought to be his.

Bibliography: Sources are: *Fasciculi zizaniorum*, ed. W. W. Shirley, pp. xliv., 289–329, London, 1858; Adam of Usk, *Chronikon*, ed. E. M. Thompson, ib. 1876. Consult further: A. à Wood, *Hist. and Antiquities of the Colleges and Halls in the University of Oxford*, i. 492, 502–510, 541, 555, and *Fasti*, pp. 34–36, Oxford, 1786; J. Foxe, *Actes and Monuments*, ed. G. Townsend, iii. 24 sqq., et passim, London, 1844; R. F. Williams, *English Cardinals*, ii. 1–32, ib. 1868 (inaccurate); G. V. Lechler, *John Wiclif and his English Precursors*, ii. 265–271, ib. 1878; J. H. Wylie, *Hist. of England under Henry IV.*, 3 vols., ib. 1884–96; G. H. Moberly, *Life of William of Wykeham*, pp. 179–180, ib. 1887; G. M. Trevelyan, *England in the Age of Wycliffe*, pp. 301–307, 2d ed., ib. 1899; J. Gairdner, *Lollardy and the Reformation in England*, i. 21–27; ib. 1908; *CQR*, xix. 59–82; *DNB*, xlviii. 26–28.

REPROBATION. See Predestination.

REPUBLICAN METHODISTS. See O'Kelly, James.

REQUIEM: The mass for the dead or for the repose of the souls of the faithful. The name is derived from the opening words of the introit, *Requiem æternam dona eis* (" rest eternal grant unto them "). It forms the principal part of the Roman Catholic burial service, since only with the offering of the eucharistic sacrifice of the requiem mass does the act of the Church become an effectual intercession with God for the soul of the faithful. Normally the requiem should be immediately connected with the burial service and precede the interment; and it should, therefore, follow the reception of the body by the Church. In the Greek Church, this is the permanent custom; the Roman Church, on the other hand, permits deviation when local, hygienic, or liturgical reasons make it inadvisable to celebrate the mass for the dead before interment. In this case, it must follow the burial, either on the same day, if possible, in connection with the burial ceremonies, which should then take place early in the morning; or else on one of the two days following. According to the rule, the coffin should be brought into the church and placed

Reason and Time of Celebration.

before the altar to signify the connection of the eucharistic sacrifice with the dead, and to characterize it as an act performed expressly in his behalf. If the burial has already taken place, a catafalque, draped in black, is substituted for the coffin. The burial service is incomplete without the requiem; the latter, on the other hand, in itself constitutes a full and sufficient act. It is repeated at regular intervals, as on the anniversary of death; in the early Church and in the Greek Church on the third, ninth, and fortieth day after death; and in the Roman Church on the third, seventh, and thirtieth day.

Ritual.

The basis of the requiem is the same as that of every other mass, but the special occasion, the mourning, the profound underlying resignation, and the particular purpose of intercession for the repose of the soul of the faithful are clearly emphasized by the character imparted to the ordinary of the mass. Black, being the color of mourning, is appropriate to the requiem. As during the Passion-tide, the hallelujah is omitted after the gradual; in its stead appears the tract and the sequence " Dies iræ," with the exception of the original three opening verses and the addition of the closing one. The sequence originally used on the first Sunday of Advent was incorporated in the office for the dead. Neither the *Gloria* nor the creed is said or sung, the latter omission being peculiar to the requiem. In the *Agnus Dei*, *dona eis requiem* (*sempiternam*) is substituted for *miserere nobis* and *dona nobis pacem*. The closing benediction is not used, since the absolution and the benediction of the dead immediately follow. Instead of the *Ite, missa est*, the words *Requiescant in pace* are pronounced. Besides this, as the office concerns only the departed, all commemorations of a festival nature and for the living are omitted, such as the incensing of the faithful and the blessing of the water at the sacrifice. After the close of the mass, the priest, with the ministrants, descends the steps of the altar, approaches the coffin (or the catafalque), and, while it is incensed and aspersed, pronounces the absolution and benediction according to the prescribed ritual. The early Church was content with appropriate interpolations (cf. the form of intercession for the dead in the Apostolic Constitutions, viii. 41), many of which have been preserved in the Roman missal. The Greek Church has no special form for the mass celebrated at the burial, or for that said for the dead; at the prothesis a portion of the oblates is designated by the name of the dead for whom the mass is celebrated, and a short commemoration is incorporated in the prayer. A requiem mass may be either public (or solemn), or private. In the former case it is choral, incense is used, and two or more of the clergy officiate; in the latter case the mass is simply read and a single priest officiates.

Strictly speaking, even in a choral requiem the music should be kept in the background; the organ should not accompany the responses; and the very character of the requiem forbids the use of other musical instruments. The singing should be confined to a musically embellished enunciation of the words of the liturgy. If given in a dignified and appropriate manner, a choral rendering of a requiem mass is, from a musical point of view, a unity, and a deeply impressive artistic creation. Nevertheless, it is quite comprehensible that a more developed musical art, when once admitted to a share in the liturgy, should turn with special favor to the requiem. Indeed, the " Dies iræ," with its wealth of varying emotions and its imagery, seems almost to challenge creative fancy to a musical reproduction and representation. Accordingly, all periods and styles of modern music have participated in the composition of requiems. It is true that in these efforts musical art has not confined itself to the limits set by the liturgical purpose of the requiem, since in the interest of a fuller rendering all means of expression and all the wealth of orchestral harmony have been employed. The requiem has thus become an independent musical creation, artistically complete in itself and suggesting the oratorio; it no longer has the sacrifice but the " Dies iræ " for its central point; and only the designation of the separate parts suggests its liturgical origin.

Musical Settings.

H. A. KÖSTLIN†.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: *Missæ pro defunctis . . . ex missali Romano desumtæ*, Regensburg, 1903; *Officium defunctorum. Choramt für die Abgestorbenen*, new ed., Paderborn, 1903; V. Thalhofer, *Handbuch der katholischen Liturgik*, ii. 323 sqq., Freiburg, 1890; J. Auer, *Das Dies iræ in den gesungenen Requiem-Messen, Musica sacra*, Regensburg, 1901; J. Erker, *Missæ de requie juxta rubricas a Leone XIII. reformatas*, Laibach, 1903; F. X. Rindfleisch, *Die Requiem-Messe nach den gegenwärtigen liturgischen Rechte*, 2d ed., Regensburg, 1903; P. Wagner, in *Gregorianische Rundschau*, no. 11, Graz, 1904. For the musical side consult: H. Kretzschmar, *Führer durch den Konzertsaal*, ii. 1, pp. 220–267, Leipsic, 1895; Tursot, in *Le Guide musical*, no. 8, Brussels, 1900.

RESCH, resh, **ALFRED:** German Lutheran; b. at Greiz (49 m. s. of Leipsic) Apr. 21, 1835. He was educated at the universities of Leipsic (1853–56) and Erlangen (1856–57), after which he was successively first teacher of religion and instructor in ancient languages at the Lutheran gymnasium at Wiborg, Finland (1857–59), a teacher at the *Bürgerschule* in Greiz (1860–61), and head teacher at the normal school in the same city (1861–63). From 1863 to 1900 he was first pastor and school-inspector at Zeulenroda, but since 1900 has lived in retirement, first in Jena and, since 1902, in Klosterlausnitz, near Jena, in Saxe-Altenburg. In theology he is a conservative and orthodox member of his denomination. He has written the following works on theological subjects: *Die lutherische Rechtfertigungslehre dargestellt und gegen ihre neueste Verfälschung verteidigt* (Berlin, 1868); *Melodienbuch zu dem Landesgesangbuch der preussischen Landeskirche* (Zeulenroda, 1875); *Das Formalprinzip des Protestantismus, neue Prolegomena zu einer evangelischen Dogmatik* (Berlin, 1876); *Agrapha, aussercanonische Evangelienfragmente* (Leipsic, 1889; 2d ed., 1906); *Aussercanonische Paralleltexte zu den Evangelien* (5 vols., 1893–97); *Die Logia Jesu nach dem griechischen und hebräischen Text wiederhergestellt* (1898); *Das lutherische Einigungswerk* (Gotha, 1902); *Der Paulinismus und die Logia Jesu in ihrem gegenseitigen Verhältnisse untersucht* (Leipsic, 1904); and *Das lutherische Abendmahl* (1908).

RESERVATION, ECCLESIASTICAL: In Germany the historic principle legally settled that any clerical belonging to one of the three recognized state religious establishments who passes from one to the other loses his position and his stipend, both returning into the possession of the church to which he belonged. The question first came up in the negotiations of the Religious Peace of Augsburg (q.v.) in 1555, on the question whether the terms of peace should be extended to those who afterward went over to the Lutherans. The Roman Catholics proposed that archbishops, bishops, and members of chapters, orders, and the like be excepted; that an apostate from the older religion lose his position and office; and that the chapter or other body be unmolested in the election of his successor from the older faith, who should remain peacefully in possession, while the matters of elections, foundations, presentations, and properties of chapters, churches, and dioceses should maintain their former status. The Protestants regarded these proposals as in the highest degree prejudicial not only to principle and person but also to religion. They proposed in turn that where any ecclesiastical territory had altered its religion it be turned over to no temporal authority or heritage, but in the case of the death or resignation of an ecclesiastic, such territory be left unmolested in its election, administration, and properties, the matter to be left open for further negotiation by the two parties; and this without trespass upon the majesty and usage of the secular powers. King Ferdinand favored the Roman Catholic position in the interest of the conservation of rights and of peace. The Lutherans made certain concessions, agreeing to the contention of the other side with the proviso of not anticipating future conventions. These provisions did not really settle the difficulty. The archbishoprics, bishoprics, abbeys, and prelatures, were in the hands of the younger princes of Roman Catholic houses; the canonries usually were given to the younger sons of counts and knights of the realm, many of whom were Protestants. By being excluded from these ecclesiastical positions, the 300 Protestants felt that their material interests were damaged. The Roman Catholics were afraid that by allowing the Protestants to occupy these positions they would secure a majority of votes in the imperial diet. Soon after the edict of religious peace had been issued the Lutherans protested against the article, and threatened to disregard it. They repeated their protests at every successive diet and further demanded the recognition of Protestant administrators in the spiritual provinces and their admission to the sessions of the diets, but in vain. In North Germany the reservation was unobserved and many districts were in the hands of the Lutheran administrators. Moreover, where ecclesiastical foundations were not immediately dependent on the empire, as in the case of Brandenburg and elsewhere, the article was not applied, exemption from it being claimed. In Strasburg compromises in 1604 maintained the mixed religious state of the district. Further progress was opposed by the Jesuits under whose influence the Roman Catholic constituents insisted at the Diet of Regensburg (1613) on the thorough carrying-out of the directions of the religious peace with respect to the ecclesiastical reservation. The question was again brought to an acute stage in the Thirty Years' War. After the successes of the Roman Catholic arms the Emperor Ferdinand II., Mar. 6, 1629, issued the so-called edict of restitution. According to this, the Protestant estates, in accordance with the terms of the Passau compromise (1552), had no right to appropriate ecclesiastical foundations, and to violate the reservation with reference to archbishoprics and bishoprics. Roman Catholics, on the other hand, had the right to demand the appointments of their archbishops, bishops, and prelates in immediate imperial provinces and monasteries. The emperor announced that he would dispatch commissions; and a considerable number of restitutions had been undertaken, when changes in the fortunes of war prevented the immediate execution of this measure. The question was settled by the Peace of Westphalia (see WESTPHALIA, PEACE OF), whereby the right of ecclesiastical reservation was not only upheld but also legalized for the benefit of Protestants as well. From that time it has been in practise. (E. FRIEDBERG.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: L. Ranke, *Zur deutschen Geschichte vom Religionsfrieden bis zum dreissigjährigen Kriege*, Leipsic, 1869; T. Tupez, *Der Streit um die geistlichen Güter und das Restitutionsedikt (1629)*, pp. 12 sqq., 77 sqq., Vienna, 1883; J. H. Gebauer, *Kurbrandenburg und das Restitutionsedikt*, Halle, 1899.

RESERVATION, MENTAL: A secret mental restriction or repression in thought, an offense against the duty of truthfulness by which a part of the truth is concealed, and so an intentional deceit prepared. It may refer either to the past or the future; to the statement of what is alleged to have happened or to be at hand, or to an assurance of something to be rendered or kept. The assertory as well as the promissory oath can thus give occasion to its commission. It may also occur in daily social intercourse. Mental reservation plays a considerable rôle in the lax moral system of the Jesuits. Many of their authors as well as some Roman Catholic moralists outside supported the use of this reservation. Among the former J. Caramuel was the most thorough-going in his *Haplotes de restrictionibus mentalibus* (Leyden, 1672). Antoninus Diana (d. 1663) taught that "if any one voluntarily offers to take an oath, by necessity or for some utility, he may use double meanings, for he has a just ground for using them" (*Resolutiones moralcs*, II., tract 15, 25–26, III., tract 5, 100 and 6, 30). So if any one requests a loan from another which the other can not give, he may say that he does not have it, reserving the mental addition, in order to loan it to him. If one is asked about a crime of which he is the only witness, he can say that he does not know it, adding mentally, as an openly known crime. On proper grounds, an ambiguous oath does not involve perjury, if, without change of form, the ambiguous sense may be produced; one does not need to confess to a committed offense before a court, if thereby an injury to self is invited; one can deny having committed it, with the reservation in mind, "in prison." Knowingly to lead any one to take a false oath is no sin because the person

who takes the oath is knowingly doing no evil; and to swear falsely from habit is a pardonable sin. For numerous parallel instances of the older and later moralists cf. Count P. von Hoensbroech, *Das Papsttum*, vol. ii., *Die ultramontane Moral*, pp. 223 sqq. (Leipsic, 1902), among which occur the scandalous example from J. P. Gury's *Casus conscientiæ* (Lyons, 1864) of Anna the adulteress, and the author's own citation from the Roman *Analecta ecclesiastica* of June, 1901; both of which cases involve an equivocating denial of an offense after absolution.

Protests against the system of mental reservation are found not only among Protestants of all classes, but the more serious Roman Catholic theology either defined it more or less closely or else condemned it positively; as, for example, the author on moral theology, G. V Pautuzzi (d. 1679), *Ethica Christiana* (Venice, 1770). The methods of modern Jesuit moralists are said to be wholly subservient to the apology and justification of moral restrictions. A. Lehmkuhl (*KL*, x. 1082–89) represents, as the only correct view, that which asserts that cases may arise in which a *restrictio late mentalis*, or external reservation or ambiguous statement, may be employed. In such cases the one speaking does not deceive so much as the one arriving at an erroneous judgment deceives himself. In such cases where the reservation is permissible, if the matter is of sufficient importance, the statement may be reenforced by oath without committing perjury. See Jesuits, II., § 6.

(O. Zöckler†.)

Bibliography: Apologetic treatment is found in: J. P. Gury, *Casus conscientiæ*, 6th ed., pp. 183–184, Paris, 1881; A. Lehmkuhl, *Theologia moralis*, i. 251–252, 453, Freiburg, 1890; F. Kössing, *Die Wahrheitsliebe*, pp. 106 sqq., Paderborn, 1893; V. Catrein, *Moralphilosophie*, ii. 75 sqq., 86 sqq., Freiburg, 1899; J. Adloff, *Römisch-katholische und evangelische Sittlichkeitskontroverse*, Strasburg, 1900. Critical discussions are: H. Reuchlin, *Pascals Leben*, pp. 108 sqq., 346 sqq., Stuttgart, 1840; F. G. L. Strippelmann, *Der christliche Eid*, i. 137 sqq., Cassel, 1855; J. Huber, *Der Jesuitenorden*, pp. 293–294, Berlin, 1873; W. Herrmann, *Römische und evangelische Sittlichkeit*, Marburg, 1901; Graf von Hoensbroech, *Das Papsttum*, ii. 223–244, Leipsic, 1902.

RESERVATION, PAPAL: The act of the pope in reserving to himself the right to nominate to certain benefices. From the close of the twelfth century instances occur in which, when clericals from elsewhere died at Rome, the vacancies were disposed of by the pope. Thus Innocent III. (1198–1216) in the first year of his pontificate gave the prebend in Poitiers of Aimericus de Portigny, who died at Rome, to his nephew who was serving in the papal chancellery, and repeatedly thereafter disposed of vacant places in like manner. The bishops thus interfered with tried to meet the encroachment upon their powers by means of procurators at Rome. The popes, however, were loath to forego the privilege they had gained, and Clement IV in 1265 made a formal " reservation of churches, dignities, patronages, and benefices which happen to become vacant in the presence of the Apostolic seat," to which Honorius IV added, in 1286, the case of one who had resigned his benefice into the pope's hands. Gregory X. ordered that appointment must take place within a month, in default of which the right would return to the bishops or their vicars general. Boniface VIII. reaffirmed this ordinance; construed " in the presence of the apostolic seat " to be a radius within two days' journey of the residence of the Curia, for the respective cases; and ordered that parochial churches that had become vacant during the disoccupation of the papal chair or that the pope had not filled before his death, were excepted. Another papal reservation related to the cathedral churches and exempt prelacies. The right to approve their suffragan bishops was gradually, from the beginning of the thirteenth century, taken away from the metropolitans by the popes, and constructed into a formal reservation by Clement V., John XXII., and their successors. After the removal of the popes to Avignon the reservations increased in scope and were exercised in such ways as to arouse bitter complaints. The Council of Basel (q.v.) ordered a general limitation of reservations, which was in the main accepted in France, but again modified in favor of the pope by the Concordat of 1516 between Leo X. and Francis I. (see Concordats and Delimiting Bulls, III., 2). In Germany the older regulations were resumed in the Vienna Concordat of 1448, between Nicholas V and Friedrich III. (see Concordats, etc., III., 1, § 2). Papal reservations were henceforth to be: (1) benefices becoming vacant *in curia*, in the original sense; (2) places in cathedral churches and immediate cloisters and foundations in which canonical election prevailed, in case the pope could not approve an election or accept a postulation; (3) likewise in case of deposition, withdrawal, transference, or renunciation, in which the pope took part; (4) a place left vacant by the holder because of the acceptance of another offered by the pope; (5) the benefices of cardinals, papal emissaries, and various Roman palace officials; and (6) benefices vacated in the odd months (see Menses Papales). Fresh extensions and interpretations of these reservations led to renewed complaints, which found expression at the Diet of Nuremberg in 1522 in the proposed abolition of the *Gravamina* (q.v.). The Council of Trent effected some reforms in favor of chapters and bishops relating to incompatibles as well as to the " mental reservations " introduced by Alexander VI., according to which a canonical election is anticipated by reserving in mind another aspirant as an intendant for the benefice (expectancy). The attempts of the popes from Pius V. to claim anew various reservations were dismissed, in Germany at least, by reference to the Concordat of 1448. Especially was the privilege denied, in the case of a resignation, where there existed a right of patronage. The above-mentioned reservations, however, remained in force generally, until the dissolution of the Holy Roman Empire. Since the restoration of ecclesiastical institutions in modern times and as a result of specific conventions between the German governments and the papal see, the papal reservations have been greatly modified, reserving to the pope mainly the highest appointments, and here and there vaguely admitting the reservations *in curia* and of incompatibles. Outside of Germany, also, there continues here and there a

restricted papal reservation, while in France and the Netherlands it has ceased. (E. FRIEDBERG.)

RESERVATION OF THE SACRAMENT: The keeping back from the public service of the Holy Communion of portions of the consecrated bread and wine for subsequent use. The earliest mention of this practise is in Justin Martyr (*I Apol.*, lxv., lxvii.; *ANF*, i. 185–186). Describing the Sunday worship of Christians, he says that distribution is made to each of his share of the elements which have been blessed, and to those who are not present it is sent by the ministry of the deacons. Tertullian (200 A.D.) speaks of the Lord's body being reserved and carried home from the public service for later private consumption (*De oratione*, xix.; Eng. transl., *ANF*, iii. 687; *Ad uxorem*, II., v., Eng. transl., *ANF*, iv. 46–47). Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.*, VI., xliv. Eng. transl., *NPNF*, 2 ser., i. 290) quotes an account by Dionysius of Alexandria of an aged man who, under persecution, had joined in an act of idolatry, but in his last sickness earnestly desired reconciliation with the Church, to whom a small portion of the eucharist was sent by a messenger. Basil (350 A.D.) writes of the custom among the religious solitaries: "All those who live in solitudes as monks or hermits, where there is no priest, keeping the communion in their houses, take it with their own hands. And in Alexandria and in Egypt each, even of the lay people, for the most part has the communion in his own house, and when he wills communicates himself. For when once the priest has consecrated the sacrifice and has delivered it, he who has once received it as a whole, and partakes of it day by day, ought to believe that he partakes and receives from the hand of him who has given it" (*Epist.*, xciii., cf. *NPNF*, 2 ser., viii. 179). This custom was naturally resorted to in times of persecution. An allusion of Jerome (*Epist.*, cxxv., *NPNF*, 2 ser. vi. 251) implies that in some cases and places the sacrament was thus taken home: "None is richer than (a bishop of Toulouse), for his wicker basket contains the body of the Lord, and his plain glass cup the precious blood." From Chrysostom's account of the attack on the bishop's church on Easter eve it appears that the sacrament was reserved in both kinds in a sacristy of the church "where the sacred vessels were stored" (*Epist.* to Innocent I., iii.). Irenæus (180 A.D.) gives the earliest known instance of the sending of the eucharist to a distance as a pledge of communion (Fragment iii. of his *Epist.* to Victor of Rome). This practise was later forbidden by the Synod of Laodicea (365) and the use of eulogia (a blessed, but not consecrated bread) was substituted. A similar custom obtained in the sending of portions of the elements (called the *fermentum*) consecrated at the bishop's Eucharist to other churches under his care, where they were mingled with the elements consecrated by the local priest. This was more especially a custom of the church at Rome.

In the Early Church.

By degrees other uses besides that of communion were made of the consecrated elements. Bread was carried as a charm for protection when traveling, or in undergoing trial by ordeal; it was buried with the dead, or in an altar; documents were signed with a pen dipped in the wine. The Synod of Carthage (397) and that of Auxerre (578) forbade administering the eucharist to the dead. As the theory of our Lord's presence in the sacrament was developed, the elements came to be used more distinctly for worship "as a center of prayer." The events of Holy Week (q.v.) were dramatized, the host (or consecrated wafer) being carried in procession on Palm Sunday, placed in a sepulcher on Good Friday, and carried in the procession on Easter Day (see PROCESSIONS). The festival of Corpus Christi (q.v.) was instituted in the thirteenth century in honor of the doctrine of Transubstantiation (q.v.) and it was probably in the next century that the sacrament was first publicly exposed on Corpus Christi Day for the veneration of the faithful. In the sixteenth century it became common to expose the sacrament at other times. The devotion of the forty hours' worship of the exposed sacrament was due to a Capuchin of Milan, who died in 1556. In 1592 Pope Clement VIII. provided for the perpetual public adoration of the sacrament on the altars of the different churches in Rome, the forty hours in one church succeeding to the forty hours in another. Of the custom of benediction with the sacrament, J. B. Thiers (*Traité de l'exposition du saint sacrament de l'autel*, Paris, 1673) declares that he found no mention in any ritual or ceremonial older than about a hundred years. In the Eastern Church, at the present day, as in primitive times, the sacrament is reserved for the purpose of communion only. For this use, some of the consecrated bread is steeped in the chalice, and is preserved in a box usually behind the altar. In the Latin Church since the Council of Constance (1414) only the actual celebrant of the mass partakes of the cup; so that the wafer alone is reserved, and that in a receptacle called a pyx (see VESSELS, SACRED), which was in earlier times placed on or above the altar but is now (except when in use for exposition or benediction) itself contained in a locked tabernacle above the altar.

Medieval and Eastern Usage.

At the Reformation the different Protestant confessions vigorously denounced these uses of the sacrament; e.g., Melanchthon's "Saxon Confession" declared, "It is a manifest profanation to carry about and worship a part of the Lord's Supper (art. xv.); cf. J. W. Richard, *Philip Melanchthon*, pp. 353–354, New York, 1898), and so the Westminster Confession (XXIX., iv.; cf. Schaff, *Creeds*, iii. 665). Art. XXVIII. of the Thirty-nine Articles is much more moderate in its wording, simply declaring that "the sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshiped." The first English Prayer Book (1549) made provision for the reservation of the sacrament for the communion of sick persons under certain restrictions, which provision was withdrawn from the second Prayer Book (1552), and provision was made only for the private celebration in the sick man's house of the ordinary service in a shortened form, including the

In the Evangelical Churches.

consecration. The question of the lawfulness in the Church of England of reserving the sacrament for the sick was considered at a formal hearing before the archbishops of Canterbury and York (Drs. Temple and Maclagan) in 1899, and their opinion was adverse. In the Scottish Episcopal Church there has been a continuous tradition sanctioning the practise; and recognized Anglican divines, such as Herbert Thorndike (d. 1672), have advocated it.

ARTHUR C. A. HALL.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: W. Palmer, *Origines liturgicæ*, ii. 232, London, 1832 (collects examples of early usage); W. Maskell, *Monumenta ritualia ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*, i. p. ccxxiii., ib. 1846; W. H. Hutton, *The English Church (1625–1714)*, pp. 329–330, ib. 1903; F. Procter and W. H. Frere, *New Hist. of the Book of Common Prayer*, pp. 77, 82, 121, 502, ib. 1905; J. H. Blunt, *Annotated Book of Common Prayer*, pp. 399, 472–473, New York, 1908.

RESERVED CASES. See CASUS RESERVATI.

RESIDENCE: The obligation on all holding ecclesiastical benefices of any kind to remain during definite periods in the districts assigned for their administration. It is a natural consequence of the requirement that every official must normally discharge his duties in person, an obligation particularly needful in the case of the clergy. So often, however, did the clergy leave the benefices to which they had been assigned, that synods passed stringent prohibitions of such abuses as early as the fourth century. Secular legislation here came to the aid of the Church, while residence was likewise stressed in the Frankish kingdom. Later the clergy were forbidden to travel without permission, nor was a plurality of benefices permitted to interfere with residence. Subsequently, however, the laws of residence were relaxed, not only as a result of pluralities, but also because canons, after the decline of chapter life, were frequently represented by vicars, while the prelates were often obliged to be absent on affairs of state. The Council of Trent accordingly renewed the requirements of residence, enacting that if any priest or prelate should be absent for six months in succession without good and sufficient reason, he should be mulcted of a fourth of his income for the year. An absence of six months more was to involve a loss of another quarter of the yearly income; still longer absence should be reported to the pope within three months, and the offending clergy should be replaced by more worthy incumbents. The council likewise stressed the requirement of personal residence for all, except in cases of evident necessity, the provincial synod being directed to guard against all abuses. Absence was, however, permitted for two, or at most three, months each year, provided it involved no detriment to the cure of souls. The permanent privileges hitherto given for non-residence and income were now abolished, but temporary dispensations were still allowed, although the bishop was required to appoint proper vicars to obviate any neglect of pastoral care. Canons might not be absent more than three months. Those who violated this rule should be mulcted of their incomes, and permanent disobedience rendered the offender liable to trial in the ecclesiastical courts.

Besides the "dignitary" and "double" (involving the cure of souls) benefices to which the laws of residence just cited apply, there are also "simple" benefices in which residence is not obligatory. A distinction is accordingly drawn between *residentia præcisa*, in which residence is required under penalty of forfeiture of the benefice, and *residentia causitiva*, where non-residence involves only loss of the income of the benefice in question. If, however, an incumbent is absent from his benefice legally, he is regarded, by legal fiction, as resident, except in cases where actual personal attendance is necessary, as for receiving presence fees (see PRESENCE AND PRESENCE FEES).

In the Lutheran Church in Germany actual residence is always presupposed, the ecclesiastical authorities providing the proper substitutes if the incumbent is prevented from fulfilling his duties. Generally speaking, leave of absence must be obtained from the president of the consistory.

(E. FRIEDBERG.)

RESPIGHI, res-pî'gî, **PIETRO:** Cardinal; b. at Bologna, Italy, Sept. 22, 1843. He was educated at the seminary of his native city and the Roman Seminary, and was then rector of a parish in Budrio until 1891, when he was consecrated bishop of Guastalla. Five years later he was enthroned archbishop of Ferrara and in 1899 was created cardinal priest of Santi Quattro Coronati. Shortly afterward he was called to Rome to fill his present position of cardinal-vicar, and in this capacity is president of the Congregation of the Apostolic Visitation and prefect of the Congregation of the Residence of Bishops.

RESPONSES. See ANTIPHON.

RESTARICK, HENRY BOND: Protestant Episcopal bishop of Honolulu; b. at Holcomb, Somersetshire, England, Dec. 26, 1854. He was educated at King James' Grammar School, Bridgewater, Somersetshire, and Griswold College, Davenport, Ia. (A.B., 1882), and was ordered deacon in 1881 and advanced to the priesthood in the following year; was curate of Trinity Church, Muscatina, Ia. (1881–82); rector of St. Paul's, San Diego, Cal. (1882–1902), when he was consecrated first Protestant Episcopal bishop of Honolulu. In theology he is a positive Churchman, and has written *Lay Readers: Their History, Organization, and Work* (New York, 1894), and *The Love of God: Addresses on the Last Seven Words* (1897).

RESTITUTION, EDICT OF. See WESTPHALIA, PEACE OF.

RESTORATION. See APOCATASTASIS.

RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD: The Christian hope of a renewal of life after death was to a certain extent anticipated by the expectation of redemption current among the Jews before the time of Christ; but its real basis is found in the teaching of Christ and in his own resurrection, though it is true that the Christian exposition of the doctrine presupposes the Jewish. While a thorough investigation of the history of the latter is rendered difficult by the uncertainty which prevails in regard to the age of the sources, a tolerably clear idea of

Basis of the Doctrine.

the nature of the hope may be gained by a comparative study of the passages which relate to the subject.

Hebrew and Jewish Representation.

The first trace of an expectation that some dead men (not the dead in general) will rise is found in Isa. xxvi. 19 (Hos. vi. 2, xiii. 14; Ezek. xxxvii. 1–14, refer to the restoration of the national and spiritual life of Israel). In this passage the hope of a resurrection appears in connection with that of a glorious future for Israel. The prophet anticipates a time when the righteous Israelites shall awake from death to a share in the blessings of the period of redemption. A fuller conception is found in Dan. xii. 2, where for the first time is contemplated a resurrection of both just and unjust, though still only of Israelites. Upon this follows a judgment, which will assign to the just eternal life in the Messianic kingdom, and to the wicked exclusion from that kingdom, "shame and everlasting contempt." Here again the close connection between the Messianic hope and that of a resurrection is to be noted. Frequent attempts have been made to adduce passages from the Psalms (such as xlviii. 14, lxviii. 20, xvi. 10–11, xvii. 15, xlix. 15); but a careful examination will show that they can not be pressed. In the deutero-canonical and extra-canonical Jewish writings of the pre-Christian era the doctrine is not strongly expressed. To conclude that it was not extensively held among the Jews of that age would be rash, but it probably had no uniform and well-defined shape. The Psalms of Solomon speak of a resurrection of the just to endless life in the Messianic kingdom, and predict everlasting death for the ungodly. Josephus (*War*, II., viii. 14) ascribes the same view to the Pharisees. On the other hand, II Macc. xii. 43–45, vi. 26, express the belief that both just and unjust Israelites shall rise and be judged. The authors of Enoch (li. 1), II Esdras (vii. 32), and the Apocalypse of Baruch (xxx. 1–5, l. 1 sqq.) expect a universal resurrection, either before or at the end of the Messiah's reign.

The New-Testament Doctrine.

The doctrine proclaimed by Christ and the New-Testament writers, while having points of contact with the foregoing, develops along its own lines. In the discussion with the Sadducees (Matt. xxii. 23–32) Jesus offers a special proof of the resurrection of the righteous (who alone are considered here); but in other sayings of his the resurrection of the ungodly is taken for granted (Matt. xi. 24). Apparently he treats both as simultaneous (cf. also John v. 28, 29); only in Luke (xiv. 14, xx. 35) is there an apparent separation, and this may be the effect of Paul's influence on Luke. Paul himself distinguishes two resurrections, or rather three—that of Christ, that of those who have died believing in him, which takes place at his second coming, and that of the other dead (I Cor. xv. 21–24). He does not define the interval between the two latter; the Apocalypse places a thousand years between them (Rev. xx. 4). Of more importance than the question of time are the proofs which Christ and Paul offer of the fact. The former, in the passage of Matthew cited above, demonstrates the resurrection of the righteous by the fact that God calls himself the God of the patriarchs, which can mean only that they will return to life, and that life, to be complete, must be a bodily life. What is true of them, is true also, as Luke puts it with a slight change of thought (xx. 38), of all the righteous. In John (xi. 25) Jesus bases his statement about the resurrection of the just on the fact that he himself is the bringer of life; the life that he now communicates to them is the pledge of their future resurrection. The argument for resurrection, and now of all the dead, is carried to its height by Paul, who finds his warrant for this in the accomplished fact of Christ's resurrection (I Cor. xv. 21–22; I Thess. iv. 14). In and by it, men are objectively freed from the guilt of sin (I Cor. xv. 17–18); and this carries with it the annulment of the penalty of sin, which is death. The New-Testament writers accordingly have no doubt of the certainty of a future resurrection; the Epistle to the Hebrews enumerates it (vi. 1) among the first "principles of the doctrine of Christ."

The Agent.

The agent in this resurrection in all the Pauline passages is God the Father (Rom. iv. 17, viii. 11; I Cor. vi. 14; II Cor. i. 9); in John v. 21, the Son is named as cooperating with the Father, and in John vi. 39, 40, 44, is the sole agent. These two conceptions are reconciled in that of the relations of God and Christ. All the dead in rising again experience the power of God (I Cor. vi. 14; Heb. xi. 19); but in the case of the ungodly this is a purely external operation, while in the righteous it is the result of the working of the spirit of life within them. This working must not, however, be limited to the maturing of a seed of life already within; the New-Testament conception is rather that to the spiritual life already begun a corresponding bodily life is added (cf. Rom. viii. 11), and so life in the full and complete sense is re-established.

The Resurrection Body.

As to the nature of the resurrection body, both Christ and Paul tell something. Both, however, speak exclusively of that of the righteous (Matt. xxii. 30; I Cor. xv. 35 sqq.; II Cor. v. 1 sqq.; Phil. iii. 21). Christ says that a higher bodily existence than before shall be bestowed, referring it, in order to make it credible, to the power of God (Matt. xxii. 29), and asserting that the methods of reproduction employed here shall no longer prevail there—though he does not assert that difference of sex shall disappear. Paul gives fuller indications. The origin of the resurrection body is from heaven (II Cor. v. 1 sqq.); it is a spiritual body (I Cor. xv. 44), "fashioned like unto Christ's glorious body" (Phil. iii. 21; I Cor. xv. 49). The designation of the body as pneumatic does not imply that spirit forms its substance, for this would not harmonize with the parallel "spiritual body" of I Cor. xv. 44, but that it is a body entirely adapted to express the spiritual life possessed by the risen saints. It is no longer an obstacle to the knowledge of God face to face (I John iii. 2; Matt. v. 8; Rev. xxii. 4); it makes possible unrestricted intercourse with the other saints, and the exercise of authority over the world (I Cor. iv.

8; Rom. v. 17; Rev. xx. 4, 6). A whole series of contrasts follows between this and the present natural body (I Cor. xv. 42 sqq.). Dishonor, consequent upon the weaknesses of the present body, gives place to glory; weakness to strength; it has not even the material substance of the present (I Cor. xv. 50). What its substance is, Paul does not tell; but his insistence on the differences between the two must not be pressed. If the new body were conceived as a wholly different body, there would be no real victory over death, which would then have its prey, God repairing the loss by a new creation. In I Cor. xv. 36–38, Paul describes the relation between the two under the analogy of the grain which "is not quickened except it die." But what is the kernel of the new body contained in the old? Since it is obviously not the substance of the old, it can scarcely be anything but the individual, characteristic form, which has remained constant throughout all the changes of the earthly life. Paul's view would thus be that God develops this form to meet the needs of a new corporal existence which shall correspond to the spiritual life of the risen soul. As noted above, he gives no indication of the nature of the bodies to be assigned to the wicked at the resurrection. It is clear, however, that a "pneumatic body" can not be bestowed upon them, if only because this is an imperishable body, incapable of being touched by the "second death." His idea probably is that those who did not die in the faith and fellowship of Christ will rise in the same bodies which they formerly possessed—those of them who are justified at the judgment then receiving their spiritual bodies, while the rejected go down, body and soul, to the second death. See Eschatology, § 6. (E. Schaeder.)

Bibliography: The subject is treated from the Biblical side in the commentaries on the passages cited, and in the works on Biblical Theology (see the lists given in and under that article); and from the dogmatic standpoint in the works on systematic theology (see in and under Dogma, Dogmatics) and especially on Eschatology (q.v.). Special note may be made of: S. Drew, *An Essay on the Identity and General Resurrection of the Human Body in Relation both to Philosophy and Scripture*, London, 1822; G. Bush, *Anastasis; or the Doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body Rationally and Scripturally Considered*, New York, 1845; R. W. Landis, *The Doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body*, Philadelphia, 1846; B. F. Westcott, *The Gospel of the Resurrection. Thoughts on its Relation to Reason and History*, London and New York, 1865; H. Mattison, *The Resurrection of the Dead, Considered in the Light of History, Philosophy, and Divine Revelation*, Philadelphia, 1866; A. H. Klostermann, *Untersuchungen zur alttestamentlichen Theologie*, Gotha, 1868; A. H. Cremer, *Die Auferstehung der Todten*, Barmen, 1870; idem, *Ueber den Zustand nach dem Tode*, 3d ed., Gütersloh, 1892; *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*, 1874, no. 2 (by Staehelin), 1877, no. 2 (by Köstlin); J. Hall, *How are the Dead Raised, and with what Body do they come?* Hartford, 1875; D. W. Faunce, *Resurrection in Nature and in Revelation: an Argument and a Meditation*, New York, 1884; C. E. Luthardt, *Lehre von den letzten Dingen*, 3d ed., Leipsic, 1885; H. W. Rinck, *Vom Zustand nach dem Tode*, Basel, 1885; F. Splittgerber, *Tod, Fortleben, und Auferstehung*, 4th ed., Halle, 1885; R. Kabisch, *Eschatologie des Paulus*, Göttingen, 1893; W. Milligan, *The Resurrection of the Dead. An Exposition of 1 Corinthians xv.*, Edinburgh, 1894; C. S. Gerhard, *Death and the Resurrection*, Philadelphia, 1895; P. Giannone, *Il Triregno (Della Resurrezione de Morte)*, 3 vols., Rome, 1895; W. F. Whitehouse, *The Redemption of the Body*, London, 1895; E. Huntingford, *The Resurrection of the Body*, ib. 1897; J. Maynard, *The Resurrection of the Dead*, ib. 1897; J. Hughes-Games, *On the Nature of the Resurrection of the Body*, ib. 1898; J. Telfer, *The Coming Kingdom of God*, ib. 1902; L. Kessler, *Religiöse Wirklichkeit. Von der Gewissheit der Auferstehung*, Göttingen, 1903; E. Wolfsdorf, *Die Auferstehung der Toten*, Bamberg, 1904; J. H. Hyslop, *Psychical Research and the Resurrection*, Boston, 1908; C. K. Staudt, *The Idea of the Resurrection in the Ante-Nicene Period*, Chicago, 1910; D. Völter, *Die Entstehung des Glaubens an die Auferstehung Jesu*, Strasburg, 1910; J. G. Björklund, *Death and Resurrection from the Point of View of the Cell Theory*, Chicago, 1910.

RETABULUM. See Altar, III., 1, b, c.

RETTBERG, ret'bārh, FRIEDRICH WILHELM: German Lutheran; b. at Celle (22 m. n.n.e. of Hanover) Aug. 21, 1805; d. at Marburg Apr. 7, 1849. He was educated at the University of Göttingen (1824–27; Ph.D., 1829), and after teaching at the gymnasium of his native city from 1827–30 went to Göttingen as lecturer in theology, where he was associate professor (1834–38), and assistant pastor at the Jakobikirche after 1833. In 1838 he was called to Marburg as full professor of theology and retained this position until his death. His most important writings are those on church history, beginning with a monograph on the life and work of Cyprian (Göttingen, 1831), and continuing with a volume treating of the papal history of the thirteenth century to carry on J. E. C. Schmidt's *Handbuch der christlichen Kirchengeschichte* (Giessen, 1834). Rettberg's chief work, however, was his *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands* (2 vols., Göttingen, 1846–48), extending from the earliest period to the death of Charlemagne. He was also the author of an apologetic monograph *Ueber die Heilslehren des Christentums nach den Grundsätzen der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche* (Leipsic, 1838), and of the posthumous *Religionsphilosophie* (Marburg, 1850).

(J. A. Wagenmann†.)

Bibliography: The funeral sermon by E. Henke contains an account of Rettberg's writings and services to the University of Marburg, and the same writer wrote the necrolog in *Kasselsche Zeitung*, no. 15, 1849, and issued an appreciation in Latin, Marburg, 1849. Consult also O. Gerland, *Hessische Gelehrten-, Schriftsteller- und Künstler-Geschichte*, i. 108 sqq., Cassel, 1863.

RETTIG, HEINRICH CHRISTIAN MICHAEL: Protestant theologian; b. at Giessen July 30, 1799; d. at Zurich Mar. 24, 1836. He studied in his native city, became teacher at the gymnasium there and privat-docent at the university in 1833; and was called to the newly founded University of Zurich in 1833. His earliest writing was *De tempore quo magi Bethlehemum venerint* (Giessen, 1823). This was followed by *De quatuor evangeliorum canonicorum origine* (1824), discussions concerning the Fourth Gospel; next came some philosophical treatises dealing also with the Greek classics (1826–1828); *Das erweislich älteste Zeugnis für die Echtheit der in den Kanon des Neuen Testaments aufgenommenen Apokalypse* (Leipsic, 1829); and *Quæstiones Philippenses* (Giessen, 1831)—in all of which he displayed rationalistic leanings. But in his next book, though not bound by ecclesiastical orthodoxy, he appeared as a faithful adherent of Biblical teaching concerning Christ as the Son of God, *Die freie protestantische Kirche oder die kirchlichen Verfassungsgrundsätze des Evangeliums* (Giessen, 1832); in the first part of this he dealt with the relation of

Church and State, arguing for the freedom of the Church; in the second part he worked out in detail a plan for a free organization. The work showed great originality, and he seems to have hoped that it would have as great influence upon the Church of his time as the counsel of Melanchthon had had in its time; he dedicated it to the princes and nobles of the two Hesses. After his call to Zurich he issued a facsimile of the Codex Sangallensis of the Gospels (Zurich, 1836). (G. KRÜGER.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: K. W. Justi, *Grundlage zu einer hessischen Gelehrten- Geschichte*, pp. 532–535, Marburg, 1831.

REUBLIN, reib'lin (ROEUBLI, RAEBL), WILHELM: Swabian Anabaptist; b. at Rottenburg-on-the-Neckar (24 m. s.w. of Stuttgart) about 1480; d. after 1559, probably at Znaim (47 m. n.n.w. of Vienna). His name appears in a great variety of forms—Reiblin, Röubli, Röublin, Reubel, Räbl, Räbel, Reble, Rubli, Rublin, being some of the alternative spellings. Nothing is known of his early life. It is to be presumed that his parents were somewhat well-to-do, as in 1559 (the last notice of him) he asks King Ferdinand for permission to avail himself of his inheritance in Rottenburg. He seems to have received priestly orders before his matriculation at the University of Freiburg in 1507. After two years' study at Freiburg he removed to the University of Tübingen, where he was enrolled Aug. 21, 1509. On July 2, 1510, he was appointed pastor at Greisheim in Schaffhausen. On July 24, 1521, he became people's priest at St. Albans in Basel, having no doubt already alined himself with the opponents of the old order. His eloquent proclamation of the Gospel and bold denunciation of the prevailing corruptions and superstitions attracted audiences estimated by contemporaries at 3,000. The trade gilds gave him their enthusiastic support. The veneration of images and the keeping of ecclesiastical fasts he strongly discouraged. In the Corpus Christi procession of 1522 he carried a large Bible instead of relics, saying, "This is the truly sacred thing, the others are merely dead bones." For this reckless zeal he was banished by the council June 27. He was invited to a pastorate at Lauffenburg, but the Austrian authorities prevented his acceptance. In the autumn following he was in Zurich, where he frequently preached in the city and surrounding towns and villages, and in 1523 he settled at Wytikon. He was married to Adelheid Leemann Apr. 28, 1523. Soon afterward he began to call in question the Scriptural authority and the propriety of infant baptism. Acting on his advice several parents withheld their infants from christening and incurred severe punishment therefor. The antipedobaptist sentiment extended to Zollikon and the punishment of recusants called forth declarations against infant baptism by Rrötli, Grebel, Blaurock, Castelberg, Manz, and others. In the Zürich disputation of Jan. 17, 1525, on infant baptism Reublin was one of the antipedobaptist speakers and he was among the first, shortly before or shortly after the disputation, to introduce believers' baptism. Banished from Zurich he went first to Greisheim and then to Waldshut, where he induced Hubmaier (q.v.), already convinced against infant baptism, to lead his adherents in submitting to believers' baptism. About Easter, 1525, he baptized Hubmaier and about sixty others and shortly afterward Hubmaier baptized about 300 more. After months of successful itinerant preaching he spent some time in Strasburg in 1526. Afterward in association with Michael Sattler (q.v.) he labored with remarkable success at Rottenburg, his home town, and from there extended his evangelizing activity to Reutlingen, Ulm, and Esslingen, where he was commonly known among antipedobaptists as "Pastor Wilhelm." He is next found a second time in Strasburg, where he asked for a public disputation with the ministers. His request was denied by the council on prudential grounds, but private discussion with the ministers was arranged for. He was thrown into prison Oct. 22, 1528. Having become "miserably sick and lame" he was released (Jan., 1529) and banished with the threat that drowning would be the penalty of returning. Failing to secure permission to reside in Constance, he made his way with wife and children to Moravia, where he entered the Austerlitz household of the communistic antipedobaptist society whose head was Jacob Wiedemann. Wiedemann, no doubt, suspected from the first in Reublin lack of sympathy with the ideals of the community and may have been unwilling to have the eloquence of the learned newcomer brought into comparison with his own uncultured preaching. Reublin is said to have criticized severely the disorder that prevailed and Wiedemann resented his expression of opinion. Though urged by several of the members to invite Reublin to preach he persistently refused and when, after his return from a journey, he was informed that Reublin had preached without his permission he was so indignant that he denounced and excommunicated him and refused to give him a hearing though urged to do so by Reublin's friends. With about 150 sympathizers, Reublin made his way almost empty-handed to Auspitz, where a new community was formed that suffered great hardship. In Jan., 1531, he was denounced and excommunicated by Jacob Huter, who had been invited by the Austerlitz and Auspitz communities to assist them in settling difficulties that had arisen, on the ground of his imperfect observance of the principle of absolute community of goods which the latter and the majority of the brethren regarded as of the very essence of the Gospel. He disappears from view for over twenty years, discouraged no doubt by his inability to work harmoniously with the Moravian antipedobaptists and being excluded from the lands in which his early years had been spent by the general execution of the sanguinary edict of Speyer of 1529. In 1554 old and infirm he returned to Basel and begged for permission to reside there and engage in humble service for the sick and poor. He was not encouraged to remain, but a considerable sum of money was given him to defray his expenses at a health resort. He returned to Moravia and is last heard of in 1559 (as above).

A. H. NEWMAN.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. A sketch of the life is furnished by G. Bossert in *Blätter für Württembergische Kirchengeschichte*, 1889, nos. 10–12, 1890, nos. 1–2. Consult further: C. A. Cornelius, *Geschichte des münsterschen Aufruhrs*, Leipsic; 1855–60; E. Egli, *Die Zürcher Wiedertäufer*, Zurich, 1878,

idem, *Actensammlung zur Geschichte der Zürcher Reformation*, ib. 1879; J. Beck, *Geschichtsbücher der Wiedertäufer in Oesterreich-Ungarn*, Vienna, 1883; L. Keller, *Die Reformation und die älteren Reformparteien*, Leipsic, 1885; R. Nitsche, *Geschichte der Wiedertäufer in der Schweiz zur Reformationzeit*, Einsiedeln, 1885; C. Gerbert, *Geschichte der Strassburger Sektenbewegung, 1524–35*, Strasburg, 1889; A. H. Newman, *Hist. of Anti-Pedobaptism*, pp. 105 sqq., Philadelphia, 1897; A. Hulshof, *Geschiedenis van den Doopsgezind en Straassburg, 1525–57*, 1905. For Reublin's justification of himself and complaint of ill-treatment at the hands of the Moravian communists cf. his letter to Pilgram Marbeck in C. A. Cornelius, ut sup., vol. ii., *Beilage*.

REUCHLIN, roiH''lîn' **(CAPNION), JOHANNES:** German humanist; b. at Pforzheim (24 m. n.w. of Stuttgart) Feb. 22, 1455; d. at Bad Liebenzell (20 m. w. of Stuttgart) June 30, 1522. After a brief course at the University of Freiburg, where he was matriculated May 19, 1470, he was a chorister in his native town and then gained a place at court in the chantry of the Margrave Charles I. The latter sent him as companion to his son to the University of Paris, where he began the study of Greek. In the summer of 1474 he worked at Basel (B.A., 1475; M.A., 1477), still continuing his study of Greek. At this period he composed his *Vocabularius breviloquus* (1475), but his teaching of Aristotelian philosophy brought him into conflict with the "sophists" of the university. He accordingly returned to Paris and resumed his Greek studies, then went to Orléans in 1478 to study jurisprudence, receiving his degree in law in the following year and supporting himself by teaching. He continued his legal studies at Poitiers and became licentiate of law in 1481. Reuchlin then returned to Germany and intended to lecture at Tübingen, but was requested by Count Eberhard im Bart to accompany him to Rome. After his return to Germany he was the counselor of the count and also practised law in Stuttgart. In 1484 he received a seat among the court judges, and two years later was Eberhard's envoy to the Diet of Frankfort, besides attending the coronation of Maximilian at Aachen. Meanwhile Reuchlin had begun the study of Hebrew. He visited Rome a second time in 1490 as the companion of the natural son of Eberhard, and two years later the count sent him to the court of the Emperor Frederick at Linz on a diplomatic mission. The emperor honored Reuchlin by conferring on him the title and privileges of a palsgrave, and here he secured instruction in Hebrew from the emperor's physician-in-ordinary, the learned Jew Jacob Loans. He now devoted himself to the mystery of the Cabala (q.v.), and in 1494 his *De verbo mirifico* appeared, in which he sought to show that God and man meet through the revelation of the mysteries contained in the marvelous names of God, especially in the tetragrammaton, the ineffable first becoming utterable through the most marvelous of all names (which he transliterated *Jhovh*, Jesus, recalling the tetragrammaton *Yhwh*), wherein man is united with God and saved.

The death of Eberhard (Feb. 24, 1496) brought Reuchlin in peril of his life from the unbridled Eberhard the Younger and the Augustinian Konrad Holzinger, who were opposed to him. He fled from Stuttgart to Heidelberg and was appointed counselor and chief tutor by the Elector Palatine Philip, Dec. 31, 1497. In 1498 Reuchlin again went to Rome on a mission for his patron, finding opportunity to continue his Hebrew studies with a learned Jew, Obadiah Sforno, and meeting Aldus Manucius at Venice. In Apr., 1499, he was again at home. During the period of his residence at Heidelberg, which was now to end, he had written, besides Latin poems and epigrams, two Latin comedies in imitation of Terence, Sergius, and Henno.

Meanwhile Eberhard the Younger had been deposed in Württemberg, and it became possible for Reuchlin to return to Stuttgart, where he was one of the three judges of the Swabian alliance until the end of 1512. In the midst of his official duties and his private practise, he found time to publish at Pforzheim, in 1506, his *De rudimentis Hebraicis*. This was followed in 1512 by a Hebrew edition of the seven penitential Psalms with a literal Latin translation and grammatical explanation for the use of beginners; and in 1518 by his *De accentibus et orthographia linguæ Hebraicæ*. In the mean time he had published in 1517 his *De arte cabbalistica*, in which the cabala was held to have been revealed to Adam by an angel and to have been preserved in unbroken tradition to the time of the great synagogue and then transmitted by it to the writers of the Talmud. The cabala was further asserted to be in harmony with the Pythagorean philosophy, which had drawn from Egyptian, Jewish, and Persian sources. The esoteric doctrines of the cabala were emphasized and the various methods of gematria were explained and exemplified.

During this period Reuchlin became involved in the controversy which was to embitter the closing years of his life. As early as 1505, in his missive, *Warumb die Juden so lang im elend sind*, he had held that the wretchedness of the Jews was a punishment for their rejection of the Messiah and their stubborn unbelief. At the same time, he did not wish them persecuted, but prayed that God might enlighten them. But Johann Pfefferkorn, a converted Jew, acted differently. He sought to compel the Jews to surrender all books contrary to the Christianfaith and to attend sermons preached for their conversion. Pfefferkorn's course won the approval of the emperor, who, on Aug. 19, 1509, issued a mandate requiring compliance with his plans. Reuchlin declined to cooperate with Pfefferkorn, while Uriel, archbishop of Mainz, forbade Pfefferkorn to work in his archdiocese until further notice. Meanwhile the Jews of Frankfort had complained to the emperor that Pfefferkorn was ignorant in these matters, and Maximilian placed Uriel in charge of the confiscation, at the same time directing him to assemble certain scholars and others, including Reuchlin, and then to decide the matter. But Uriel delayed, and on July 6, 1510, Pfefferkorn obtained from the emperor a new requirement that the archbishop should merely secure the written opinions of those he had before been directed to consult, these decisions being intended for the emperor's consideration. On Oct. 6, 1510, Reuchlin accordingly delivered his opinion. He distinguished between obvious impieties, such as the *Nizaḥon* and the *Toledoth Yeshu*, which should be destroyed after legal investigation

and condemnation, and the others, which should be preserved. The latter were divided into six categories, characterized partly as having no bearing on Christianity (as philosophy and natural science), partly as unobjectionable (liturgies), partly as indispensable for understanding the Bible (commentaries), partly as defending the Christian faith (the cabala), and partly as containing much of value along with superstition (the Talmud). He likewise held that the Jews were not heretics, but could claim legal protection. The opinions of the other scholars were radically different, and Maximilian determined to lay the matter before the diet, but no actual steps were ever taken.

The literary controversy, however, still dragged on, and Pfefferkorn finally offered to be judged by the emperor, the archbishop of Mainz, a university, or the inquisitor. Reuchlin replied to Pfefferkorn in his *Augenspiegel* (1511), but the pastor at Frankfort, Peter Meyer, judging the book heterodox, inhibited it and sent a copy to the Dominican Jakob Hochstraten, inquisitor of the province of Mainz, who submitted it to the theological faculty of Cologne. Arnold of Tungern and the Dominican Konrad Köllin, commissioned to examine it, required Reuchlin to withdraw all copies and publicly to beg his readers to consider him a true Catholic and an enemy of the Jews and especially of the Talmud. This was demanding too much, and after a series of further polemics, including Reuchlin's *Ain clare Verstentnus* (1512) and *Defensio contra calumniatores* (1513), the emperor was prevailed upon to silence both parties in June, 1513. Reuchlin now endeavored, through Frederick the Wise, to have the mandate extended to all his opponents; and the attempt of a Dominican to malign Reuchlin to the elector led both Luther and Carlstadt to express themselves in his favor. Frederick answered the Dominican with diplomatic reserve; but meanwhile the Cologne faction had secured from the emperor the confiscation of the *Defensio*, while Hochstraten had gained the condemnation of the *Augenspiegel* from the universities of Louvain, Cologne, Mainz, Erfurt, and Paris. Reuchlin was accordingly cited before the court of the inquisition at Mainz (Sept. 9, 1513). He failed to appear, but appealed to the pope, and then went to Mainz in the hope of a peaceable understanding. Failing in this, he again appealed to the pope, who entrusted the decision to the Palsgrave George, bishop of Speyer (Nov., 1513). George cited the parties concerned and delegated judgment to the learned canon Thomas Truchsess, a pupil of Reuchlin's. On Mar. 29, 1514, judgment was rendered in favor of Reuchlin, whereupon Hochstraten appealed to the pope, and a committee of twenty-two was finally appointed, which, on July 2, 1516, decided in Reuchlin's favor. At this moment, however, a papal *mandatum de supersedendo* was issued, and judgment was postponed indefinitely, though Hochstraten remained for a year in Rome, vainly endeavoring to secure the condemnation of the *Augenspiegel*.

Reuchlin had the sympathy of the Humanists, as was evidenced both by their letters addressed to him, which he published as *Clarorum virorum epistolæ* (Tübingen, 1514, and Zurich, 1558) and *Epistolæ obscurorum virorum* (q.v.). He had a powerful protector in Franz von Sickingen (see SICKINGEN, FRANZ VON), who warned the Dominicans, and especially Hochstraten, to leave Reuchlin in peace. A final court was now determined upon, which met at Frankfort in May, 1520, and, condemning Hochstraten's attitude, recommended that the provincial should prevail on the pope to end the controversy and enjoin silence on both parties, while the Dominican chapter deposed Hochstraten from his offices of prior and inquisitor. At Rome, however, Reuchlin was now considered to be in sympathy with Luther, and on June 23, 1520, the papal decision was rendered in favor of Hochstraten. Reuchlin appealed in vain to Rome, and Sickingen with equal futility to the emperor. But interest in the controversy was at an end—the problem of Luther had appeared.

On Feb. 29, 1520, Reuchlin was appointed by Duke William of Bavaria professor of Greek and Hebrew at Ingolstadt, but early in the following year the plague compelled him to go to Tübingen, where he lectured in 1521–22.

The indirect services of Reuchlin to the Reformation were considerable. In 1518 he recommended his great-nephew Melanchthon as professor of Greek at Wittenberg; yet his own attitude toward Luther was unsympathetic, as was his feeling toward the Reformation in general. (G. KAWERAU.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY: A notable source is the *Acta judiciorum inter Fr. Jacobum Hochstraten . et Johannem Reuchlin*, Hagenau, 1518. Lives have been written by J. H. Mai, Durlach, 1687; H. von der Hardt, Helmstadt, 1715; S. F. Gehres, Carlsruhe, 1815; E. T. Mayerhoff, Berlin, 1830; F. Barham, London, 1843; J. Lamey, Pforzheim, 1855; and L. Geiger, Leipsic, 1871. Consult further: Melanchthon's *Oratio continens historiam J. Capnionis*, in *CR*, xi. 999 sqq.; L. Geiger, *Johann Reuchlins Briefwechsel*, Tübingen, 1875; idem, in *Vierteljahrsschrift für Kultur und Litteratur der Renaissance*, i (1886), 116 sqq.; E. Schneider, in *Zeitschrift für Geschichte des Oberrheins*, xiii. 547–599; F. W. H. Cremans, *De J. Hochstrati vita et scriptis*, Bonn, 1869; L. Geiger, *Das Studium der hebräischen Sprache in Deutschland*, Breslau, 1870; idem, *Renaissance und Humanismus*, pp. 504 sqq., Berlin, 1882; D. F. Strauss, *Ulrich von Hutten*, Leipsic, 1871; Horawitz, in the *Sitzungsberichte* of the Vienna royal academy, philosophic-historical class, 1877; K. Hartfelder, *Deutsche Uebersetzungen klassischer Schriftsteller aus dem Heidelberger Humanistenkreis*, Heidelberg, 1884; G. H. Putnam, *Books and their Makers*, i. 426 sqq., ii. 172, 202, 226, 237, New York, 1897; idem, *Censorship of the Church of Rome*, i. 83 sqq., 233, 335 sqq., ii. 44 sqq., 217, ib. 1907; J. Janssen, *Hist. of the German People*, iii. 44 sqq., St. Louis, 1900; F. A. Gasquet, *The Eve of the Reformation*, 159–160, 163–165, New York, 1901; *Cambridge Modern History*, i. 572 sqq., ii. 695–696, New York, 1902–04; N. Paulus, *Die deutschen Dominikaner im Kampfe gegen Luther*, pp. 94 sqq., 119 sqq., Freiburg, 1903; T. M. Lindsay, *Hist. of the Reformation*, i. 67 sqq., New York, 1906; the introduction to the *Epistolæ obscurorum virorum*, ed. F. G. Stokes, London, 1909; Schaff, *Christian Church*, v. 2, pp. 625–630; O. Pfleiderer, *Development of Christianity*, 177–179, New York, 1910; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, viii. 774 sqq.; *KL*, x. 1101–1109. Most of the works which deal with the Reformation and the early Reformers have some discussion of Reuchlin.

END OF VOLUME IX.